(ii) Forty-second Report on Action Taken by Government on the Recommendation/Observations contained in the Thirty-Fourth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Information Technology on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) relating to the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology (Department of Telecommunications).

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS -- *Contd.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Shri J. Chitharanjan.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I am grateful to you for allowing me to participate in this discussion.

First of all, I would like to pay my homage to Late Kalpana Chawla and six other astronauts, who died in the recent accident in the disintegration of space shuttle, Columbia.

Madam, then, I deal with the Iraq situation, in the President's Address. All of us know that, at present, the Iraq issue is of utmost concern for the entire international community and of course, for the Indian people also. Unfortunately, the Government of India has not made its policy clear in this respect. Paragraph 71 of the President's Address says, "We share the concern of the entire world on the unhappy situation relating to Iraq. We have deep interest in peace, stability and security in that region. We hope that the wisdom of the international community, expressed through the UN Security Council, will result in a peaceful resolution of this matter..." Yesterday, the hon. Prime Minister has made a speech at the business forum of the NAM. There also he did not spell out as to what exactly is the policy of India in this respect is. The sole Super Power, the United States, declares some of the States as rogue States or evil States. They say that the countries, which have large amount of arms, would be attacked. They say that they would dictate terms to the United Nations Organisation itself.

The Security Council is being asked to take a decision in their favour. And then they go on to say that even if the Security Council does not agree to their demand, they, along with their allies, would attack Iraq, and in that case U.N.'s existence will be in danger. This is what the American President, Mr. George Bush, is saying. Madam, if this thing is allowed to happen, what will be the outcome? America may attack Iraq tomorrow and the next day, Iran may be attacked and then, they may attack North Korea also, and then, some other country might be attacked. It might become the rule of the day; an unwritten rule of the day. The question is: Will we be spared? On the same ground, one day, India can also be attacked. In para 70, the President has stated this and I quote: "The Gulf region is of great importance to India. The region is a major source of India's energy needs, a major economic partner in trade and investment. Over 3.5 million Indians are engaged in the economic development of the Gulf countries." So, if this attack does take place, what would happen? The geo-political situation in the whole region will have to be redrafted. It will have its own repercussions and it will very much affect us. Of course, we have trade relations with them. We are dependent, to a large extent, on them for our energy requirements. Around 3.5 million Indians are working in the Gulf countries. If war were to break out, it will be very difficult for these people to remain there. I don't know whether they would be able to leave during war-time. For the present, this can be kept aside. But we will have to face the problem of rehabilitating these 3.5 million people. Will it be a small problem? No; it will be a very serious problem. Therefore, I want to say that the Government has to, categorically, declare the policy that is being adopted in this particular matter. I think, the Government should, categorically, say that we don't agree with the tactics followed by the super-powers; we don't agree that they have got the right to attack any country they like. No country should be allowed to do that. The United States is dictating terms to the United Nations. We should, categorically, say that we don't agree with that also. We should demand that some more time should be given to Iraq. Those who are inspecting the arms in Iraq, should be given some more time to do the testing. After all these tests, let the U.N. decide whether Iraq should be attacked or not. No individual country can take a decision over that. The Government of India should make this point clear. But after observing the stand taken by the Government, and the reluctance and hesitation on their part to categorically declare their policy, I am led to believe that this Government is doing so with a deliberate intention of wooing the United States of America. In that

case, the prestige of our country will go down. This is what I have to say about that.

Now, I come to my next point. The President has, in his speech, pointed out that our economy is growing at a faster pace. He has mentioned that problems are being solved, and that the percentage of poor people has come down, etc. Unfortunately, I don't agree with the views expressed by him. What exactly is the real situation? For example, take the case of agriculturists. About 65 per cent of the people in our country depend on agriculture. The agricultural labour, farmers, etc. depend on agriculture only. For the last 3-4 years, because of the heavy fall in production of the agricultural products, their life has become miserable. They have suffered severe losses. And, not only this, they are heavily indebted. Therefore, out of desperation, some of them have committed suicides. So, this is the real situation.

Now, I come to the question of workers. Of course, it has been claimed in the President's Address that the Government is committed to safeguard their interests. But, now, what is happening? In the public sector units, workers are being sent out on VRS. About eight lakh people have already been sent out on VRS. And, now, in all the public sector undertakings, the second round of sending on VRS has already started. The State Bank of India has decided that 60 per cent of its employees -- that means more than 1,20,000 employees -- will be sent out on VRS. If this goes on, what will be the situation? Of course, they will get some money at that time, but there is no safety. No arrangement is being made to provide them protection, in the form of providing alternate employment opportunities, etc. Nothing of that sort is being done. It will create problems. The same thing is happening in the private sector also. Our traditional industries, for example, *beedi,* weaving, cashew, coir and a large number of other industries are all in crises. There is no work. Workers are not getting proper wages. On the other hand, the Government is trying to amend the labour laws in a retrograde manner. Under the circumstances, workers are very much worried. That is why, a large number of Central Trade Unions like AITUC, CITU, HMS, and UTUC have joined together and decided at a Convention held in Delhi, on 15th of last July to carry on a march to Parliament on 26th of this month itself. But, unfortunately, the situation is such that it will be very difficult for us to convene the march. The police are not allowing us. I, alongwith Shri Gaya Singh, met hon.

Home Minister. We talked to him. He was very cooperative. He talked to the Governor, and the Governor talked to the police officers. The police officers said that we would not be allowed to get out of the Ram Lila maidan. And, now, they are saying that we may be allowed to go a little ahead, but, thereafter, we will be stopped. In a democratic country like ours, why can't the people be allowed to carry on marches and demonstrations in streets to express their grievances, to raise their demands, etc?

In the case of Iraq, in all the capitals of various countries in the world, big demonstrations took place. In London, it was reported that 20 lakh people participated in the demonstrations, but nothing happened there. They expressed their views against war and for peace. They raised slogans and conducted demonstrations. Why, in a country like ours, people are not allowed to conduct demonstrations and to carry on march. Therefore, I think, the Government should reconsider this issue.

Thirdly, I would like to say that the President's Address, has raised some hopes that the Tenth Five Year Plan, which has already been approved by the Government, as well as, the National Development Council, is going to be implemented. Of course, the target set, that is, eight per cent growth is very high. It has been stated that about five crore jobs would be created. All these are laudable objectives, but, Sir, I am doubtful whether these targets would be achieved. Madam, for implementing the Plan, what is first required is resources, the financial resources. The first suggestion that is made in this regard is to raise 10 billion every year. That is the proposal. Madam, from 1991 onwards since we begun to implement the globalisation or liberalisation programme, we have been trying to get more and more Foreign Direct Investment. For the first nine years, what we have got is only $ 27 billion. That means, on an average, we are getting only $ 3 billion every year. During the last two years, I think, perhaps, it might have gone up to $ 4 billion, and, this year, we are getting round about $ 4 billion only. So, will it be possible, in the coming years, to have a sudden jump from $ 3-4 billion to $ 10 billion? This is one thing.

The second thing is, another source on which we can depend on is the revenue resources. In the President's Address also, it has been said, "In the case of realisation of tax revenues, we are lagging behind." On most occasions, in several cases, we could not even fulfil the budgeted

targets, and the realisation was less. Therefore, the President has stated in his statement that two things will have to be done in this regard. The first thing that he has said was that realisation of tax will have to be increased, and the other thing which he has pointed out was that the governance should improve. Madam, let me say that it is always being said that workers are the main hindrance in the production and the working of the industry; it has been said that workers are preventing the flow of the FDI into the country. But, Madam, what will happen to these FDIs? All of them say that they want to come forward and express their readiness to invest money here, and pursue it for three or four years, but they do not get the necessary clearance from various Government Departments. The things do not move forward. Therefore, most of the people may leave. After waiting for two or three years or even four or five years, they will leave. Why is it so happening? It is because of the red-tapism, and also because of the long-binding procedures. These are basically the main stumbling blocks. Why couldn't this problem solved so far? How can we expect that it would be solved within the next one or two years? I do not think it can be solved within that time.

Madam, the third thing is with regard to the tax. Even in a country like India, the number of people who are having -- according to the tax figures -- an annual income of Rs. 10 lakhs and above is only 54,000. This is the position in a country which is having a population of more than one billion. Madam, about 15-20 per cent people is expected to be in a better-off position, *i.e.*, their economic position has improved. If it is so, why has the number of tax-payers remained so low? Madam, what happens is, only the Government employees or the teachers or the employees in the private sector are taxed. They will all be taxed because their salaries are fixed, and, from them, the tax could be realised at source. Therefore, it is being realised. But most of the people who are able to give tax, are out of the tax net. That is one thing. The other thing is, even if some taxes are levied on these people, most of them evade paying tax, and become defaulters. That is what is happening. That also is not being looked into seriously. Therefore, it is the question of resources. Another question that is to be considered in the case of resources is that of small savings or the national savings. In our case, the percentage of national savings is coming down from 25-26 per cent to 22-23 per cent. That is what has happened. The steps that have been taken by the Government to re-fix the interest rates and to reduce the interest rates have already proved to be a sort of

disincentive to the depositors. Therefore, the possibility of increasing the national savings is also becoming difficult. Moreover, there are reports that the Government is intending to persuade the small investors to approach the stock exchanges, and in that case the national savings will not be raised. Therefore, resources do not have any prospects also. In such a situation, because of the difficulty in raising resources, the targets could not be attained. With regard to the growth rate, the first year of the Plan is going to end by 31st March. But what will be the growth rate? In the Budget, it was estimated 6.5 per cent. Later on, it was assessed 5 per cent to 5.5 per cent. Now, it has been assessed that it would be 4.4 per cent. Thus, we could attain only that much growth rate. If you look at the previous years also, we could not attain 8 per cent growth rate during the last ten years. In some years, we have reached around, above 5 per cent or, at the most, 5.5 per cent. Therefore, it will be difficult, or, I think, it will be impossible to attain these targets, and if targets are not being attained, the other expectations also will be belied. Therefore, my suggestion is that the Government should seriously consider as to how the Plan could be implemented and as to how the resources could be realised.

Thirdly, I would like to say in respect of communalism. The President has stated that Gujarat election has strengthened the democracy. He has also stated that we should see that communal disturbances or riots do not take place in any part of the country. What is happening in our country? Of course, in Gujarat the BJP had won the election; they had come to power. I do admit. But, at the same time, everyday the leaders of the VHP are proclaiming from the housetops that they will repeat what was done in Gujarat. What was the peculiar nature of developments in Gujarat? In Gujarat, people were communally divided. In fact, the people belonging to the minority communities were being persecuted. But, it is a fact that people belonging to the minority communities in Gujarat are very much afraid of their future. They are also complaining that when other developments took place in Gujarat, even when certain relief measures were announced, certain compensations were announced, most of the people who deserve relief and compensation were not given those benefits. That complaint is also there. Now, the VHP leaders are saying that this country will have to be made a *Hindu Rashtra*. It is very difficult to believe that these things are being said by these people without the knowledge and consent of those who are in power, or else, nobody will dare to do that. Every day they are coming and saying, this country -- a secular, democratic

country according to the Constitution -- will be made a *Hindu Rashtra*. Then, they again say that in Ayodhya the temple will be constructed. That problem is there. But they are adding to the problems. Take, for example, what is happening at Dhar near Indore in Madhya Pradesh. A problem was also created there. Then in Chikmagalur, another problem was created. Recently some of them have said that 3,000 mosques will have to be returned. Then somebody said that 30,000 mosques will have to be given. When all these things are being freely propagated from the housetops, the Government keeps mum on these matters. No POTA is applied against them; no law works against them. That is what is happening. Therefore, if the Government is serious to see that secularism is maintained, communal disturbances are not taken place and communal harmony is maintained, the Government will have to take serious steps with sincerity, or else, it won't help us. Now, I come to the other question. Madam, it has been stated in the President's Address that, it is the prime concern of the Government to safeguard the interests of the weaker sections and the working class, and to ensure welfare measures for them. But, what is happening? There are several labour laws in the country, and I can say this with confidence, that in larger parts of the country, none of the provisions of the labour laws is being implemented, and I am prepared to prove this fact. In several places, the Labour Department is quite ineffective, it is dormant, and that is the situation. The existing labour laws are not being implemented. That is one thing. Secondly, there was the Provident Fund Scheme. Under this scheme, a higher rate of interest used to be given on the amounts that were being accumulated, and finally, the workers used to get the benefit of it. But now, they are reducing the rate of interest on such accumulation in stages, in phases. Again, they are thinking of reducing the rate of interest. If this is the situation, how can they say that they are looking after the welfare of the workers? How are they favouring the workers? Madam, in the beginning, I have said that workers are being thrown out of employment on the basis of the VRS or they are being retrenched on one pretext or the other. In a country like ours, the biggest source of employment is the cottage and village industries, and not the modern industries. Of course, modern industries are also necessary. But, at the same time, compared to the modern industries, more employment would be provided by the traditional industries and the cottage industries. That is the situation. What is the condition of these industries? They are being neglected completely. Their problems are not being attended to, and whatever concessions used to be given in the past for the cottage, handloom and weaving sectors, they are

being withdrawn one after another. Therefore, they are all in great difficulty. Therefore, that claim has also been negated.

Regarding education, in the President's Address, it has been claimed that in the matter of compulsory elementary education for children between the age of 6 to 14 years, all of them will be provided free education. But, what was the result? Last year, the amount allotted for that purpose was only half of what was required, and now, reports are regularly appearing in the Press, that this year also, that is, during 2003-04, the Budget allotment for this purpose is going to be very meagre, and this task will remain unfulfilled.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chitharanjan, will you conclude now?

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: So far as the question of higher education and technical education is concerned, what is happening here? Now, the engineering colleges and the medical colleges are being given to self-sustained institutions. What are they doing? If a student wants an admission in those institutions, in that case, in some institutions, you have to give Rs. 35 lakhs. Leave aside the high fees that he has to pay, a capitation fee up to Rs. 35 lakhs is being charged for these coursesl Even for certain courses, which are not so important, Rs. 12 lakhs to Rs. 14 lakhs are being charged. Even for a B.Ed course, lakhs of rupees will have to be provided. Therefore, if these things go on, people belonging to the poorer sections, the lower middle class, and even the Government employees, including the higher ups, won't be able to get their wards admitted in the aforesaid courses in these institutions. How much salary does the highest Government officer get? I think, it is somewhere between Rs. 30,000/- and Rs. 40,000 per month. How can that officer make up Rs. 25 lakhs or Rs. 35 lakhs for the admission of just one of his children in the medical or engineering college? How can he raise that money? Here, we all say that there shall be no corruption, but these people are willing to be involved in that corruption. Therefore, if this continues, a situation will arise when the people belonging to the lower strata of the community and even the middle class will be denied the opportunity of getting higher education in the technical field, whether it be in the medical or engineering cadre. This is the situation. Now, in such a situation, my suggestion is that the Government will have to seriously consider the points raised by me, as also by some

other hon. Members in the House. Unless this is done, all the expectations of leading the country to a higher trajectory of growth and improving the living conditions of the people will become difficult to achieve. Instead of that, the people of this country will be thrown to misery. With these words, I conclude.

श्री दीनानाथ मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदया, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में एक जगह पर कहा गया है कि 1999 में प्रधान मंत्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने लाल किले के अपने भाषण मे इस देश को 2020 तक विकसित राष्ट्र बनाने का उल्लेख किया है। यह राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कहा है। लेकिन आज से पांच साल पहले स्वयं श्री ए.पी.जे. अब्दुल कलाम ने अपने एक सहयोगी के साथ मिलकर एक पुस्तक "इंडिया 2020" लिखी है। यह कोई मामूली पुस्तक नही है। पांच-सात सौ वैज्ञानिको, तकनीकी विशेषज्ञो, समाजशास्त्रियों, अर्थ-शास्त्रियों ने बहुत लम्बे-चौड़े विचार-विमर्श के बाद जो निष्कर्ष भारत के विकास के सपने के निकाले, उसको उस विज़न ऑफ न्यू मिलेनियम वाली इंडिया 2020 मे रखा है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह बहुत बड़ी बात है। यह बहुत बड़ी बात इसलिए है, क्योकि स्वतंत्रता संग्राम के दिनों में पूरे देश मे एक राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य था - स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति करना। वैसा कोई लक्ष्य बाद के दशको मे नहीं रहा। जो भी लक्ष्य रहे - समाजवाद का या समाजवादी ढांचे से समाज को बनाने का या और भी ऐसे लक्ष्य थे, वे सब लक्ष्य ऐसे साझे लक्ष्य नहीं थे, जिस साझे लक्ष्य के बारे में जो एक बात राष्ट्रपति जी ने पुस्तक लिखकर कही है, और धीरे-धीरे उसका वातावरण उन्होंने बनाया है। वह एक महत्वपूर्ण घटना है इस देश के जीवन मे। विकसित देश होने की एक आकांक्षा उन्होंने जागृत की। अंडरकरेन्ट के रूप में तो यह पहले से था, मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि मेरे जैसे लाखो लोग, दशको तक संघ की शाखाओ मे जो प्रार्थना बोलते हैं, उसमे परम वैभव नेतुमेतस्य राष्ट्रम कहते हैं । विश्व की अजेय शक्ति की बात करते हैं। अतः अंर्तधारा में वैभवशाली राष्ट्र अंतकरण की बात पहले से थी, लेकिन ए.पी.जे. अब्दुल कलाम जैसे वैज्ञानिक ने इसे राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य के रूप में परिभाषित कर दिया। यह बात लिखी, पुस्तक लिखकर उन्होंने कहा, यह बड़ी बात थी। अब धीरे-धीरे इसको उन्होंने अपना मिशन ही बना लिया लगता है। जहां भी वे जाते हैं, वे एक बच्ची का उल्लेख करते हैं । उन्हें वह दस साल की लड़की मिली थी। जब कलाम साहब ने उससे यह पूछा कि उसकी क्या एम्बीशन या महत्वाकांक्षा है तब उसने कहा कि मैं विकसित भारत में रहना चाहती हूं। उसी लड़की को कलाम साहब ने यह पुस्तक समर्पित की है और उसके बाद मुझे नहीं लगता कि उन्होंने कोई भी अपना भाषण दिया हो जिसमें उसका उल्लेख न किया हो । वे अक्सर यह उल्लेख करते हैं । धीरे-धीरे मुझे लग रहा है कि 1947 के बाद से राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य का जो अभाव चल रहा था 1947 के बाद से, अब यह राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य बिलकुल साफ-साफ पारिभाषित होकर भारत में सामने आ रहा है । लोग उत्साहित हैं, लोग सचमुच सपना देख रहे हैं इस बात का । अब वैसी बात नही रही जैसी पहले थी । लोगो को लक्ष्य समझ मे आ रहा है । इसलिए जब अब्दुल कलाम साहब को राष्ट्रपति पद के लिए उम्मीदवार बनाया गया, तो मैंने एक लंबा लेख इसी विषय पर लिखा था । जब उनका पत्र आया समर्थन के लिए जो हर सांसद के पास, विधायक के पास गया होगा तो मैंने वह लेख उनको फैक्स किया । वह जब उनको मिला तो उनकी प्रतिक्रिया बहुत अच्छी रही । मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि यह जो लक्ष्य सामने है, यह राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य है कि इस देश को विकसित देश बनाना है, यह एक बहुत बड़ी ऐतिहासिक बात है । यह मनोरचना अपने आप में बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है । यह मनोरचना पहले से थी, यह नहीं कहूंगा मैं ।

बहुत सब-कांशियस स्टेज में थी, अंडर करेंट के तौर पर थी लेकिन सुपरिभाषित रूप में, वेल डिफाइंड फारमेट में उस पुस्तक में आई उसके बाद बार-बार उल्लेख करके उन्होंने इसे राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य घोषित किया । राष्ट्रपति अभिभाषण में भी इसका उल्लेख करना और उसको प्रधान मंत्री के लाल किले के भाषण से जोड़ कर बताना, इसे भी मैं बहुत बड़ी बात मानता हूं ।

मुझे लगता है कि यह असंभव नहीं है । यह संभव लगता है, इसलिए कि डेवलपमेंट के और बाकी तमाम तरह के मामलो में पैराडाइम शिफ्ट होने लग गया है । मैं ऐसा क्यों कह रहा हूं? एक व्यंग्यकार रहे हैं शरद जोशी, अब दिवंगत हो गए हैं, उन्होंने पुराने पैराडाइम पर एक व्यंग्य लिखा था । उस व्यंग्य का नाम था "पोस्ट ऑफिस" । वह बहुत लोकप्रिय व्यंगय था । कैसेट भी थे उसके । मैं उतना नहीं कह पाऊंगा लेकिन उसमे से दो बातें कहूंगा जो पैराडाइम शिफ्ट को बताने के लिए मुझे ज़रूरी लग रहा है । शरद जोशी ने लिखा कि अंग्रेज़ों ने भारत की डाक व्यवस्था बनाई । उनको तो भारत से कोई मोह था नहीं । उन्होंने जहां चाहा, वहीं पर लाल डिब्बा लटका दिया । अगर हम बनाते तो कैसे बनाते ? सबसे पहले, पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना में दिल्ली मे प्रधान मंत्री पहले डाक घर का उद्घाटन करते । दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में राज्यों की राजधानियों में पोस्ट ऑफिस बनते और मुख्य मंत्री उद्घाटन करते । उसके बाद जैसे-जैसे राजनीतिक दबाव बढ़ता जाता, जैसे-जैसे आंदोलन होते जाते, जैसे-जैसे मांग उठती जाती, वैसे-वैसे राजनीतिक फैसले करके वहां पोस्ट ऑफिस खोले जाते । यह एक बात थी । हम अगर पोस्ट ऑफिस बनाते तो यह लाल डिब्बा जो हर जगह लगा दिया है, हम इसे बहुत सुरक्षित रखते । बाकायदा एक कमरा होता । उसके बाहर पहरा होता । वह दस बजे से लेकर पांच बजे तक खुलता । दरबान खड़ा रहता । दरबान को उसका हक यदि मिल जाता तो वह अंदर जाने देता और आप पोस्ट कार्ड डाल सकते थे । नहीं मिलता तो आप बैठे रहिए, पोस्ट कार्ड नहीं डालने देता । तो सिस्टम किस तरह से कमज़ोर है, इस पर उन्होंने व्यंग्य किया । पोस्ट कार्ड बहुत बड़ी चीज़ होती । पोस्ट कार्ड लेना बहुत बड़ी चीज़ होती । व्यंग्य में यह कहा गया है कि अगर हम पोस्टल व्यवस्था चलाते तो पोस्ट कार्ड कैसे मिलते ? एक पंडित जी हैं, जिन्हें पोस्ट कार्ड की जरूरत है । उन्होंने एक विधायक से सिफारिश की । उन्होंने फोन कर दिया । वे एस.डी.ओ. के पास गए । एस.डी.ओ. के पास लाइन में खड़े हो गए । एक बार उनको झिड़की भी खानी पड़ी कि हमारे पास और काम नहीं है क्या ? क्या सिर्फ पोस्ट कार्ड देने का ही काम है? वे लौट आए । दूसरी बार गए । उन्हें परमिशन मिली । तीन फार्म भरने के लिए दे दिए । फॉर्म ट्रिप्लीकेट में भरना था - नाम, पिता का नाम, गांव, पता, लिंग, वैवाहिक स्थिति इससे पहले कब पोस्ट कार्ड लिया था । ये सारे विवरण ट्रिप्लीकेट में भरिए । वे भरकर लाइन में लगे । लाइन मे लगे तो उस दिन नम्बर नहीं आया । दूसरे दिन चालान में पैसे जमा कराए । यह बड़ी लंबी कहानी है । मैं संक्षेप मे कह रहा हूं । पैसे जमा कराकर वे पोस्ट कार्ड ले आए । बड़े विजयी भाव से घर में घुसे । अपनी पत्नी और बच्चों को बताया कि पोस्ट कार्ड लाया हूं । पोस्ट कार्ड मिल गया । बच्चे खुश कि पापाजी पोस्ट कार्ड लाए हैं, पापाजी पोस्ट कार्ड लाए हैं । बच्चे खुश । पूरे मुहल्ले में हल्ला मच गया । मोहल्ले के लोग इकट्ठे हुए और कहने लगे कि पंडित जी, आप तो बहुत प्रभावी आदमी हैं । पोस्ट कार्ड ले आए । आपको बहुत-बहुत बधाई । कुछ हमें भी बताइए कि कैसे पोस्ट कार्ड लाएं । यह मैंने बहुत संक्षेप में बताया लेकिन उन्होंने बहुत प्रभावी व्यंग्य लिखा था । बात यह है कि वह जो पैराडाइम था, जिसमें सांकेतिकता पर जोर था कि समस्या से पचास कदमों में निपटेंगे । वह पैराडाइम अब धीरे-धीरे बदल रहा है । यह कैसे

बदल रहा है, इसके बारे मे दो-चार नमूने बताना चाहता हूं । पहली बात तो यह है कि जब मैं राज्य सभा का सदस्य बना तो मुझे इसी सचिवालय के एक सज्जन मिले । उन्होंने बड़ी दबी जबान से कहा कि आप लोगों को गैस कनेक्शन देने की फार्म की कॉपियां मिलती हैं । हमारे पास एक ऐसा आदमी है जो पचहत्तर हजार रुपए में एक कॉपी ले लेगा । अखबारों मे पहले ही बहुत छप चुका था कि सांसदों का यह जो गैस कनेक्शन की कॉपियां देने का मामला है उसमें बहुत भ्रष्टाचार चल रहा है । कई बार छपा था । मुझे बहुत गुस्सा आया । मुझे उसे जितना डाँटना था, डाँटा । लेकिन एक साल तक गैस कनेक्शन की मांग रही । उसके बाद गैस कनेक्शन की मांग इतनी नही रही । कहानी क्या हुई ? कहानी यह हुई कि पिछले कई दशको मे तीन करोड़, सैंतीस लाख गैस कनेक्शन दिए गए थे। राम नाईक जी मंत्री बने । राम नाईक जी ने अपने अफसरों से पूछा कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा कितने गैस कनेक्शन प्रतिवर्ष दिए जा सकते हैं ? बहुत कोशिश करके, टारगेट बढ़ाकर एक लाख प्रतिवर्ष वाले टारगेट को खत्म करके अफसरो ने कहा कि दस लाख गैस कनेक्शन दे सकते हैं । नाईक जी मैथोडिकल आदमी हैं । उन्होने पूछा कि क्या एक करोड़ गैस कनेक्शन हर साल नहीं दिया जा सकता ? एक करोड़ गैस कनेक्शन हर साल बाँटकर उन्होने दिखा दिया । इन तीन वर्षों में तीन करोड़, चौदह लाख गैस कनेक्शन दिए गए । हमारे गैस कनेक्शन हमसे कोई नहीं मांग रहा है । लाइन खत्म हो गई । वेटिंग लिस्ट समाप्त । संबंधित भ्रष्टाचार खत्म । यह पैराडाइम शिफ्ट का नतीजा है । यानी समस्या को एकमुश्त निर्धारित समय मे पूरी तरह समाप्त कर देना ...**(व्यवधान)**...

एक माननीय सदस्य : इसीलिए अनकम्फर्टेबल है ।

श्री दीनानाथ मिश्र : मैं तो यह एक फिनोमिना बता रहा हूं । इससे यह उम्मीद बंधती है कि हम भी, यह देश भी, बहुत तेजी से, बहुत गति से, सौ गुणा गति से विकसित बन सकता है । सौ गुणा गति इसलिए कह रहा हूं क्योंकि इसमें सौ गुणा गति है । अब टेलीफोन पर आइए । यह तो दूसरी तरह का इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर है । 1999 में कुल मिला कर एक करोड़ 86 लाख टेलीफोन थे । पिछले साल की जो उपलब्धि है उसमें बहुत कुछ बदला है । एक बात जो आप भी जानते हैं और मैं भी जानता हूं, वह यह है कि यहां 5-5 साल की वेटिंग लिस्ट थी । लोग व्यापार चालू करना चाहते थे तो नये टेलीफोन की ज़रूरत पड़ती थी । उनको तुरन्त चाहिए होता था तो वे 50-60 हजार रूपए का कहीं से टेलीफोन कनैक्शन खरीदते थे और बेनामी चलाते थे । भ्रष्टाचार इतने गजब का था कि लोग परेशान रहते थे । यहां तक कि लाइनमैन भी अलॉटेड टेलीफोन नंबर के लिए भी बख्शीश पाने की कोशिश करते थे । पिछले चार वर्षों में 2 करोड़ 68 लाख नए टेलीफोन कनैक्शन दिए गए । मतलब यह कि पिछले दौर के मुकाबले कम से कम 40 गुना रफ्तार से टेलीफोन वितरण का कार्य हुआ । 1999 तक पीसीओज़ की संख्या पूरे देश में 3 लाख थी और आज यह संख्या 11 लाख है । क्वांटम जंप यानी समस्या को मुकम्मल तौर पर हल करने का तरीका था। कोई वेटिंग लिस्ट नहीं, कोई करप्शन नहीं । आज हमारे यहां टेलीफोन डेंसिटी 5 हो गई है । मुझे मालूम है कि पड़ोसी देशों में और चाइना में यह डेंसिटी कितनी है । इस समय हम चाइना के मुकाबले तो कही नहीं हैं, मगर यह जो रफ्तार है वह सराहनीय है । यह पैराडाइम शिफ्ट है । सैलफोन की संख्या आज एक लाख से बढ़कर एक करोड़ से ऊपर हो गई है । अगले दौर में यह स्पर्धा जितनी बढ़ रही है उसे देखते हुए मैं मानता हूं कि अगले पांच साल में सेलफोन के मामले में हमारा एवरेज भी विकसित देशों के

मुकाबले में आ जाएगा । संचार का इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर का जो यह सैक्टर है, उसमें यह बड़ी क्रांति है । आज इस समय 85 प्रतिशत गांवों में टेलीफोन पहुंच चुके हैं और 13 प्रतिशत गावों में इस साल के अंदर और पहुंच जायेंगे, सिर्फ दो परसेंट अन-कनैक्टेड गांव बचेंगे। यह एक बहुत बड़ी तेज कनैक्टिविटी है और यह कम्युनिकेशन इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर का एक बहुत बड़ा सैक्टर है । उम्मीद की जा सकती है कि दूसरे सैक्टरों में यही सौ, डेढ़ सौ गुना रफ्तार की संभावना हो सकती है । डेढ़ सौ गुणा रफ्तार वाली बात मैं एक और सैक्टर की भी कर सकता हूं । पिछले 50 वर्षों में चार और छः लेन वाली सड़कें कुल मिला कर 556 किलोमीटर बनीं । अब 2007 तक 15 हजार किलोमीटर लंबाई की सड़कें देश भर में बन जायेंगी । अब यह गोल्डन क्वाड्रीलेटरल प्रोजैक्ट जो है उसका काम बहुत तेजी से चल रहा है । सड़क निर्माण की रफ्तार का जो औसत है वह डेढ़ सौ गुना की गति से इस समय हो रहा है और विश्व स्तर की लंबाई-चौड़ाई की सड़कें इस समय बन रही हैं । मैं इन सभी बातों को विकास के मामले में पैराडाइम शिफ्ट मानता हूं । यह इस सरकार ने ही कर दिया है, ऐसी बात नहीं है, जब बुनियाद बनती है तभी यह होता है । अगर सुख राम जी ने टेलीफोन वाले मामले में वहां तक नहीं पहुंचाया होता तो यहां तक ये नहीं पहुंच पाते और भी बहुत सी बातें कही जा सकती हैं। जैसे कम्प्युटर का मामला है, जिसमें हम आगे बढ़े हैं। कम्प्युटर के मामले में राजीव जी की पहल को लोग याद करते हैं। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि इस दौर में आकर इस बात की संभावना जरूर विकसित हुई है कि भारत एक विकसित देश बन सकता है । यह राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य निकल कर सामने आया है, जिस ओर गति बढ़ती चली जा रही है।

उपसभापति महोदया, अभी जो वक्ता बोल रहे थे, मैं उनकी तरह निराश नहीं हूँ आप हुडको को लीजिए। हुडको ने 29 साल के अपने जीवन में यानि वर्ष 1971 के बाद से लेकर 11000 करोड़ रुपए का ऋण मकानों को बनाने के लिए दिया था, लेकिन 29 साल और इस 4 साल की तुलना में इन 4 वर्षों में इससे ज्यादा, यह 11000 जो पहले वाला आंकड़ा है, इस 11000 से कुछ ज्यादा का ऋण 60 लाख मकानों के लिए दिया है। ये बातें अपने आप में क्वांटम जंप की हैं, तौर-तरीके बदलने की हैं, समस्या का मुकम्मल ढंग से सामना करने की हैं । विकसित अवस्था में पहुंचने के लिए यह राष्ट्रीय मूल्य बनने की जो स्थिति बनी है, उससे यह विश्वास पैदा हुआ है कि हम विश्व स्तर की चीजें प्राप्त कर सकते हैं, लक्ष्य प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। यह जो विश्वास पैदा हुआ है, जो आम विश्वास है, इसे पैदा करने की स्थिति में लाने में सभी पार्टियों, सभी सरकारों, सभी पक्षों का बहुत योगदान रहा है। इसलिए मैं इस बात को ध्यान में लेकर कि यह जो विकसित देश की स्थिति में देश को लाने का प्रयास, जो राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य के रूप में सामने आ रहा है, उसको मैं ऐतिहासिक मानता हूँ और इसी के साथ मैं अपना कथन यहां पर समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh) : Madam, only seven minutes are left. Should I continue?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, you can start. Then we can adjourn for lunch. You have thirty six minutes to speak.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH : Thank you, Madam, for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address moved by Dr. L.M. Singhvi. Madam, exactly, an year ago, while participating in the similar debate, I expressed serious concern about the deteriorating economic situation in the country and the lack of proper debate and discussion on such vital issues as economics that directly affect the quality of life of one billion people of our country. It is very unfortunate that even after 50 years of Independence, we still have not come to realise as to what our priorities are. Unfortunately, we seem to be getting overwhelmed, at regular intervals, by many historical aberrations for which generally there are no easy solutions.

Madam, I want to emphasise that we cannot turn the clock back. We cannot correct every mistake that had occurred some 500 or 600 years back. We are now living in a more civilized world, in the sense that there are many checks and balances that seek to prevent flash points. We are all witnessing how the countries like Germany, France are able to stand-up to the aggressive posturing of a unipolar country like the United States, *vis-a-vis* Iraq. The world has become a very small global village. Thanks to the technological developments that have taken place in the country, the distance across the globe has really shrunk. The world is very different now than what it was earlier during the last 5,000 years. In a sense, it will not be possible any more for the mightier nations to subjugate the weaker nations and occupy the weak. We used to call the historical leaders like Alexander and Napoleon as the greats. But they are no longer the greats. In true interpretation of the term, they can be described as land-grabbers. The true leaders who have inspired us and whose lives have inspired us are Mahatma Gandhi, Baba Amte and Mother Teresa. They deserve to be called the greats, not the land-grabbers like Alexander because the great people, disregarding their personal interests, have tried to reach out to those underprivileged who have been suffering, regardless of the religion and caste of the person. Every religion -- although it came into existence by promising greater peace and prosperity, order and tranquillity -- the world history shows, unfortunately, was the source of the greatest sorrow and suffering. Many battles were fought in the name of religion. We have heard about the Crusades which were fought for 300 years. They have been fought in the name of religion, sectarianism, bigotism and fanaticism. We are seeing today the problems between various sects of Christianity, Islam and Hinduism. Still, we can authoritatively say that the problems have

1.00 p.m.

not been solved. In our own country, it is rather unfortunate that the upper caste and the privileged class have been treating our less fortunate, under-privileged and low caste Hindus with all the contempt without any parallel in the history. Even today in a majority of our villages, the Dalits continue to be ill-treated. It is not without a reason that Karl Marx described the religion as the opium of the masses. I would like to quote what Charles Colton had said. He said, "Men will wrangle for religion, fight for it, die for it, anything but live for it". Before the emergence of democracy, religion with all its limitations had still a role to play in the sense that it was providing the basis for personal law and order. Now, fortunately, we are capable of making laws on our own because we are living in a democratic country, without having regard to the religion. It is precisely keeping in mind the damage that the religion can do to this country, a decision was taken by the Constituent Assembly to make secularism as edifice of this country, as the very foundation of our constitutional and democratic set up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, before Shri Ramachandraiah finishes his speech, I will take the sense of the House, and if the House so agrees, we can adjourn the House for lunch after he finishes his speech, because he has got exactly 36 minutes, and still 30 minutes more are there.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : I think he can continue after lunch.

SHRI C.RAMACHANDRAIAH: As the House decides.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, Shri Ramachandraiah, you can continue after lunch. The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock

The House re-assembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock,
[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the Chair.]

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH : Sir, the wishes of the Indian people have been very aptly reflected in the speech of our President. In para 5 at page No.2, he says: "Our people are impatient to achieve 100 per cent literacy, health for all, shelter for all, prosperity through knowledge-driven productivity and a better quality of life -- all of these enriched with our value

system." This is true because the country is besieged with so many problems, and it has to address these problems first. And, the time has come when the Government should concentrate on improving the general well-being and quality of the people of our country. If possible, as I had requested the Government earlier, we should declare a moratorium for at least 100 years on all controversial issues -- the need of the hour is to empower the people, to improve the economic standards of the people -- which have been affecting this country and which have downgraded the prestige of the country among the Comity of Nations. Sir, many a time without our own knowledge, we take up issues which we, think, will assuage the feelings of the people. But, in fact, they end up exactly the other way round. That is why I want to emphasise, -- as the Prime Minister has proclaimed that India is going to achieve 8 per cent growth rate -- we should achieve it. That is the imperative need of the hour. And, this 8 per cent growth rate has to be achieved over a period of time, say, 10-15 years, in order to provide respectable living to the people of our motherland. Sir, the Central Statistical Organisation has recently announced that the growth rate for this year 2002-03, which is the first year of the Tenth Plan, will be somewhere around 4.4 per cent. It is much, much lower than what we have expected and proclaimed to achieve. The Ninth Five-Year Plan completed in the month of March, 2002 with an overall GDP growth rate of just above 5 per cent. That, even in the first year of the Tenth Plan, that is the current year, India registered a meagre growth rate of 4.4 per cent, which is ominous. And the reason which has been given by the President of India in his statement, which reflects the opinion of the Government, that because of the drought situation the GDP growth rate has gone down. So, for a large country like India, in any given year, we will have droughts, floods, earthquakes and different types of natural calamities and this reason alone cannot be attributed for the reduction in the growth rate that has been achieved. The planning authorities should have taken into consideration all these facts before fixing the target rate of 8 per cent. Otherwise, we will be only ending up by extending the excuses, at the end of every year, as we have done by the end of the Ninth Plan, because we could not achieve the proclaimed rate of 6.5 per cent. Sir, there is no justification for such a low growth rate, especially in the last three years of the Eighth Plan, we could achieve 7.2 per cent. Therefore, the Government cannot take shelter under the theory that they have inherited a bad economy.

Sir, on page no.5 of the President's Address, the President has said, "the recent dip in the estimates of the GDP growth has been almost entirely due to the shortfall in agricultural production." That is why, I am emphasising this point. This has, once again, highlighted the need to rescue our agriculture from its excessive dependence on monsoon, by increasing the public investments in irrigation and in all other inputs that increase the farm productivity. So, the Government has realised the necessity of stepping up the investments in agricultural and industrial infrastructure. Sir, the fact that a drop in agricultural growth rate was responsible for an overall decline in the GDP growth makes it much more painful because 66 per cent of the work force of this country depend on agriculture, and naturally, their real income has fallen substantially. Sir, we have been continuously repeating this aspect and I feel they deserve to be reiterated on the floor of the House. As per the select macro-economic and financial indicators, provided by the RBI, the growth in agricultural production was 2.2 per cent for the decade 1992-2002 as against 5.2 per cent for the decade 1981-1991. Sir, there is a substantial decrease of 60 per cent over a decade's time. Because this sector happens to be the key sector for the economy of our country which employ the largest work force. It has got much greater bearing on the overall economy of the country. This might have been one of the reasons for the paradoxical situation that we had in 2002, when the country had a buffer stock of 70 million tonnes of foodgrains on the one hand and yet, on the other hand, more than 25 per cent of our population was reported to have been under-nourished. This is clearly indicative of the situation where a majority of the people are dependent on rural and agro-based economy, not having a purchasing power beyond the sustenance level, which is one of the main reasons for the lack of growth in the aggregate demand for goods. So, when a person gets the purchasing power to buy goods of his necessity, there is an increase in the aggregate demand for goods. The increase in the aggregate demand for goods will increase the industrial production of the country and, consequently, the people will have surplus money and savings so that they can again invest them in the industrial and agricultural infrastructure of the country. Sir, I need to emphasise that reforms in agriculture are a must; productivity has to be increased. I have earlier also many times in the House emphasised that the productivity level of the Indian farmer is very low, especially so far as cotton, wheat and paddy are concerned, when compared to the levels in developing countries - leave alone the developed countries. Then, irrigation facilities have to be

enlarged. At present, only 39 per cent of our land is under irrigation. Irrigation facilities have to be increased, and productivity has to be increased. The Government should take up on a war-footing the water conservation and water harvesting techniques. The quality of seeds and other inputs should be substantially increased. It is a pity that the reduction in the interest rate has not benefited the agricultural sector. I have mentioned in this very august House several times in the past that one of the main reasons for non-achievement of the targets of the Ninth Plan was the shortfall in the achievement of targets relating to investment and capital formation. The post-liberalisation Finance Ministers and Governments, I should say, seem to have been entertaining an illusion that their role has shrunk after the adoption of the policy of privatisation and liberalisation. Perhaps, they think that the job is done merely by announcements of various policy initiatives. There is no doubt that in the changed economic paradigm, the role of the private sector has increased, but that does not mean that the role of the public sector has got diminished. More and more open market does not mean a lesser and lesser role of the Government; it only means a different role of the Government.

I will now come to the aspect of constraints that the country is facing in achieving the target of 8 per cent growth. One of the greatest constraints is investment. Investment is the key factor for attainment of Plan objectives. The Ninth Plan had very consciously envisaged public investment to the tune of 33.5 per cent in recognition of the fact that there is a strong complementarity between the private sector investment and the public sector investment and that would accordingly impact and influence the private investments. It has been accepted; In the RBI Report, Mr. Ahluwalia, the noted economist, has observed that there is a strong complementarity between the public sector investment and the private sector investment. Unless we step up investment, there will not be private investment commensurate with public investment. This is the RBI Report. As against the targeted 33.5 per cent of public investment in the Ninth Plan, we were able to achieve only 27.3 per cent, i.e., to achieve 5 per cent growth rate. Now one can easily imagine what would be the level to which the investment has to be stepped up, to achieve 8 per cent growth rate. Going by the figures of the last Budget, there is no evidence that the Government would be able to do any better, as the revenue deficit for the year 2003 is around Rs.95,000 crores. Sir, with a Budget outlay of Rs.4,00,000 crores for the year 2002-03, the revenue deficit is around Rs.95 crores. This is 70 per

cent of the fiscal deficit. Sir, in a developing economy, fiscal deficits are normal, but it is the revenue deficit which has become the villain of the economy. The Government should try to contain it. In every Budget, the Finance Minister has been announcing that they are going to initiate measures to contain the revenue deficit, but nothing has been achieved so far. The Government of India is coming out with a Bill for imposing financial discipline in the country. It is a welcome step to do financial consolidation. But the Government of India should also initiate measures on its own first so that it can impose measures on the State Governments. For example, did the Central Government consult the States when it agreed to implement the recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission, which has shattered the economies of the States, apart from the financial position of the Government of India? If you take the revenue deficit of the year 1997-98, the year in which the Fifth Pay Commission Report was implemented, you will find that there was a steep increase in the fiscal deficit. Today, the fiscal deficits of all the States and the Centre put together have exceeded 10 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product of this country. It is a very alarming situation. The interest payments of the Government of India constitute 77 per cent of the total revenue of the Government of India, after disbursal to the States. It is a very alarming picture. It is necessary for the Government of India to address all these problems first. Where is the priority? Still we are unable to identify it properly. That is my concern. A major chunk of the revenue has been retained by the Government of India, and every year, the States are facing a stupendous task in undertaking rehabilitation of people affected by earthquake, floods and droughts. Sir, the Government of India should come out with a mechanism so that the States are endowed with more financial resources.

Sir, I have been telling about the impact of the lower investments and lower capital formation in agriculture. The ratio of capital formation in agriculture has dropped from 14.27 per cent in 1970 to 7.96 per cent in 2000. Over a period of 30 years, the investments on capital formation in agriculture have been reduced by 50 per cent; from 14.2 per cent to 7.96 per cent. During this period, the share of agriculture in GDP has risen from 7 per cent to 8 per cent, which makes it clear that capital formation in agriculture has not even kept pace with the increase in its own share in the GDP.

Sir, here I would like to quote the Report of the Reserve Bank of India. It says, "The lack of capital has been a primary factor impeding the

adoption of new technological inputs which are capital intensive. The size and flow of financial resources into agriculture, both in terms of investment and working capital, have shrunk significantly, and despite the stipulation of sub-targets for agriculture at 18 per cent, under priority sector, funds have not flown to the desired extent." It is clear from the report that deficiencies had been well identified, but no action has been initiated. Sir, I have got no objection if you create more funds for technological development in the textile sector, in the sugar sector. But, ultimately, you have to set up a Technology Mission for improving the productivity of the farmer in this country. That should be the first step. But without taking the first step, you are going to the second one. It will not yield results.

Sir, I have narrated all the constraints that have been faced by the country, and the reluctance on the part of the Government of India to address the needs, the problems, on priority. Sir, at this rate, how do we achieve this 8% growth rate in real terms, especially with the given trend - in the very first quarter, the growth rate that has been predicted by the Statistical Organisation being at 4.4%? My advice is, you better increase your spending on creation of capital assets. Of course, it has been said and it needs to be repeated again. You increase the spending on creation of capital assets, even if it means increase in fiscal deficit, so long as it doesn't result in additional revenue deficit.

I quote one historical example. When China faced a 3.5% fall in prices, in the second half of 1998, and reduction in the aggregate demand for various products, for the first time ever it had experienced in decades, the Chinese Government didn't think twice on stepping up the Governmental expenditure in various infrastructural sectors, like irrigation, power and others. They speeded up the implementation of the 1.2 trillion US$ infrastructure development. They speeded it up. In just six months' time, the Treasury issued additional money worth 30 billion US$ to take up various additional projects. This policy yielded several immediate dividends - for example, investment in fixed assets rose by 22.7% in the first quarter of 1999, over the same period of the previous year. The sharpest rise was in agriculture, at 122%, followed by transport and communication at 46%, and housing by 35.5%. The GDP growth touched 8.3%, according to the official estimates, in the first quarter of 1999. The industrial production registered a growth of 10.1%. These are the facts that are available. It is history! They have been benefited by it. Why can't we adopt this?

When India opened up its economy in 1991, there were great expectations of the flow of foreign direct investment into the country. We liberalised many things. We created a hassle-free atmosphere for inviting the foreign direct investment. It was expected to create large industrial infrastructural assets, which, in turn, could create employment, and revenue generation of the Government. We expected a minimum of 10 billion US$ per year. The expectation was mainly based on certain facts like India being a true democratic country, having a free press, having independent judiciary, having a very big pool of scientists, with a substantial population speaking the English language. We kept all these assumptions in mind while we made these expectations. At the end of the first decade, looking back into retrospect, it is very disappointing to note that 60 per cent has gone into the secondary market operations. Already we have received 2 billion dollars per annum, and that put together till today, we have received 40 billion dollars. Even whatever amount that has been received as foreign direct investment, 60 per cent has gone into the secondary market and acquisition of assets, the companies. So, only 40 per cent has gone into the creation of new capital assets. So, it is only very poor creation of the industrial infrastructure that took place. I personally feel, Sir, the poor performance in this sector is due to the poor image of our country among the comity of nations in respect of cost and completion of processes. Whenever I interacted with some foreign investors, even recently during my last visit, they complained about enormous delays and corruptions. (*Time-bell rings*) Sir, I am concluding.

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, we have been given 36 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Let him speak fast.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I fear if I speak fast I may indulge in some aberrations, because I have assumed a new role.

The complain about inordinate delays and corruptions which is much lower in countries like China, Taiwan, Korea, etc. That is why most of the investments are not coming into our country as compared to those countries. It is not that we did not embark upon second-generation reforms. It is not the reason, as far as my knowledge goes, because they

truly need speedy disposal, even in respect of judiciary also. I had interactions with some investors and other people in Europe and other parts of the globe. Their complaint is about delays and not much about the quality. Therefore, we need to look into these aspects. Otherwise, we will end up nowhere, although there exists considerable scope for India to emerge as one of the biggest outsourcing base for manufacturers.

Sir, I agree that as a fallout of economic reforms, the Government should, as far as possible, disengage itself from business. This does not automatically mean that the Government has no role to play in the economic development of this country. The primary point to be kept in mind is - it is one of the points which has been made clear - that privatisation should not lead to creation of monopolies in this country. Even the hardcore protagonists of privatisation say that monopolies in the private sector are detrimental to the people of this country. It has to create competition. The concept of privatisation is to create competition which should ultimately benefit the consumers. We are not here to create monopolies in place of public monopolies. Sir, we seem to be enjoying the so-called feel good factor for all our wrong reasons. We have got a very huge foreign exchange reserve to the tune of US $ 80 billion, in the face of a huge accumulated foreign trade deficit during the last one decade. We have a very booming stock market in the face of dwindling industrial growth rate and closure of an unprecedented number of industrial units. We have been claiming that we have got a very low inflation rate because a large section of people, who are employed in agriculture and other rural activities, have got very limited money to buy industrial goods. It is not because of the fact that the industrial production has gone up. But it is because money that is available with the people of this country is very limited and this limited money is chasing the goods that are available. That is the reason why, I can analyse, there is a low rate of inflation. Inflation, in simple terms, means too much money chasing too few goods. We have a situation where there is no money in the hands of a larger section of the society to chase even those too few goods. Sir, my entire speech is based on one principle. Economic development is the panacea of all the evils of this country, both external and internal. If the country is developed economically, the country is respected by the comity of nations. Internal problems can also be solved and that is the need of the hour. And, the Government of India should come forward and the problems that are being faced and the concerns that are being expressed to achieve this economic growth need to be addressed on a war

footing. Unless we achieve that, we cannot commend the kind of respect that we wanted to commend among the comity of nations. The focus, therefore, has to be entirely on the economic development and nothing else, especially controversial issues. We have had enough politics. It is not without any reason that politicians are blamed very frequently, as they always approach every issue with an eye on elections. They say, "A statesman always works for the next generation." Let us try to graduate into statesmen.

Sir, now, I come to the foreign policy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Kindly conclude.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I am concluding in two minutes. We have been, consistently, pursuing a very broad-based foreign policy. There has not been much radical change in our foreign policy that was formulated in the early 1950s. It has been guided, mainly, by the principles of Panchsheel, which is based on non-alignment. Even as a very poor and young country, India provide leadership to all the Third World Countries by taking up their issues like Apartheid in South Africa and in other African countries. We never remain silent spectators in crucial situations such as the Korean War, Vietnam War, Gulf crisis, induction of China in the UN, etc. So much so, when we were engaged in three wars with Pakistan, the Organisation of Islamic Countries stood with India. What I am trying to say is, we should have a very pragmatic approach toward our foreign policy so that our interests are sub-served. It is very unfortunate that we do not have good relations with our neighbours, you take either Nepal or Sri Lanka or Bangladesh, or, even China and Pakistan. There is no use of making huge allocations for Defence at the expense of the development of the country. To avoid this, the only solution is maintaining good relations with our neighbours. The formulation of the policy should be with this focus in mind.

In conclusion, I would like to say, first, you identify the priorities of the country. You should try to address the problems of this country on a war footing. The focus should not be on irrelevant issues; it should be on relevant issues, which will improve the economic conditions of the country. The focus should be on one issue at a time. If you want to focus on many issues at a time, it will get diluted. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for having given me this opportunity to participate in this Motion of Thanks for the Address by the President of India to the Parliament. I had a very careful look at the text of the Address. At the outset, I would like to point out what struck me the most, that is, the Address envisages a vision, a dream for India - 'Vision 2020'. Accepting the fact that there are 260 million people below the poverty line, you are hoping to achieve 100 per cent literacy, health care, shelter for all and prosperity through knowledge-driven productivity, and a better quality of life! I was wondering how dreams and visions remain dreams because we don't understand the reality of our times. In fact, Newton once said, "If one sees further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants; only then you can see far." But, here, we have a regime that cannot see beyond its nose, a regime, the leaders of which cannot see beyond their nose, how can that have a vision of India in 2020? The politics of today has been reduced to cows, to the eating habits of individuals, to the distributions of *trishuls*, and to the sludge of terrorism. That is the politics of today, which is unconcerned with the problems of the 21st century - the problems about which it has to think of - the problems relating to water availability for production and for drinking. There are people in the West, who think in terms of what is going to happen by the end of this century or the middle of the century. There may be water wars. There may be problem of migration because of economic needs, because of necessity, because of poverty - massive migrations from one nation to another; also, having something to do with climate change. And, of course, the sludge of terrorism; terrorism not by States necessarily, but terrorism by non-State actors. And, in the field of health, the HIV AIDS has destroyed the GDP of many a country because the AIDS virus affects the youngest, those who participate in and contribute to the economy of the country. We in India have 4.99 million HIV AIDS victims in this country. And these are official figures. Do we have a policy on that? I will come to that a little later. There is going to be a mismatch between the needs of society and the availability of resources in our country. Have we addressed ourselves to those issues? There is the problem of energy, which is the fuel necessary for development. These are issues which we have to tackle in the 21st century. I am afraid to say that all that we intend to tackle, through the dispensation that is ruling us, is the problem of where what is going to be built every year in March, of that given year. And, I believe, as I speak, others have planned to do a *gherao* of this august House. Sir, if I look at paragraphs 14 and 15 of the Address of the President, there is something

that I want to place before the Members of this House. Paragraph 15 talks about Ayodhya. It says, "The dispute on Ayodhya can be resolved either through negotiations between two communities or through the verdict of the Judiciary which has to be accepted by all concerned. While the Judiciary should expedite its work and give an early verdict, it is also necessary for political parties, religious leaders and eminent social personalities to promote an atmosphere of mutual understanding, goodwill and accommodation." How much of that have we seen in the few days when we have witnessed rather unsavoury events, where our Prime Minister, in Himachal Pradesh, made a speech in respect of a matter which is *sub judice*, and indicated to the people of this country that there is evidence to show that a particular structure was, in fact, underneath the disputed site? Is this the way to resolve this dispute through negotiations? May I just inform the House that at present, as far as the Ayodhya case is concerned, all the witnesses of the Plaintiff have already been examined, 23 witnesses of the Plaintiff stand examined, and 14 witnesses of the Defendant stand examined. There are a few more witnesses that the Defendant has to produce and everything is going to be over as far as evidence is concerned before the end of the year. We are going to have arguments by the end of the year, and very soon verdict is also going to be given. And, yet, year after year, come February, come March, there is the *Dharam Sansad*; there is the VHP, who raise the ante because some election is going on somewhere. And in the President's Address what is stated is that we must promote an atmosphere of mutual understanding. In fact, what is sought to be promoted is an atmosphere of misunderstanding. Instead of uniting the nation and promoting the togetherness that Dr. L.M. Singhvi talked about in the beginning of the debate, do we seek to divide the nation, only for short-term political gains? How far is this justified? Just the other day, in fact, an issue had come up where this Government moved the Supreme Court for the purposes of early hearing of a matter. And publicly a statement was made that the undisputed site, that has been the subject of acquisition, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court, should be returned, saying, that the Supreme Court has, categorically, stated that that site can be returned. Now, this is, to say the least, an untruth; an absolute untruth. May I, with your permission, Sir, tell you what the Supreme Court said in the Ismail case? Let me preface it by saying that the total acres involved in this structure are 67 acres and the alleged undisputed part is 43 acres. The Act sought, not to touch the undisputed structure because as far as the disputed structure is concerned, it could not be the subject-matter of

acquisition because that had to be decided through adjudication, through court. The other part is the undisputed structure. As far as the undisputed structure is concerned, that was the subject-matter of acquisition. I am not talking about any current dispute. Sir, I am telling you what the Supreme Court said, as far back as 1994. I am just placing a decision of the Supreme Court.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh) : There is nothing like an undisputed structure. There is only one disputed structure and the rest is undisputed land.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: No; there are various buildings on land. I am sorry. If my learned friend permits me, I would like to inform him what has been acquired is through the Land Acquisition Act, and...*(Interruptions)*...

प्रो0 रामबक्ष सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूं कि जिस संबंध में विद्वान वक्ता ने माननीय अटल जी के भाषण को उद्धृत किया और कहा कि सब-जुडिस मामला है, उसी मामले को वे स्वयं उद्धृत कर रहे हैं। छह मार्च को उसकी डेट लगी हुई है। आप इस तरह से उसकी पैरवी कर रहे हैं जैसे अदालत में खड़े होकर करते हैं। क्या यह सही है? क्या आपको यह कहना चाहिए? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : चलिए, अब आप राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर अपने आपको केन्द्रित करिए।

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : सर, उसी के बारे में कर रहे हैं, because the President's Address talks about this.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : मैंने देखा है। उसके बारे में पैरा है, लेकिन ज्यादा नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : क्योंकि यह आम जनता के सामने बताया गया है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि जो अन-डिसप्युटिड लैंड है, वापस नहीं दी जायेगी।...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल : यही पाइंट तो सब-जुडिस है। स्पेशली यही पाइंट तो सब-जुडिस है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : कोई सब-जुडिस नही है। I am quoting from a judgement of the Supreme Court.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु (पश्चिम बंगाल): सर, जजमैंट कैसे सब-जुडिस हो सकता है? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : मैं उसे आपको पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... I am reading the judgement.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : सर, जजमेंट कैसे सब-जुडिस होगा? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: A judgement cannot be *sub judice*.

प्रो0 रामगोपाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इनसे यह पूछा जाए कि जब मामला सब-जुडिस है तो ये सड़कों पर क्यों चिल्लाते हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): आप रोज़ अयोध्या के बारे में बातें कर रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand) : I want a ruling from the Chair. Just now, my learned friend, Mr. Sibal...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: It is not *sub judice*.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He accused the Prime Minister of mentioning about the Babri Masjid or Ayodhya issue in Himachal Pradesh, while campaigning for elections. He said, "since it is a *sub judice* matter, he should not have raised this issue"...(*Interruptions*)... When we are calling it a *sub judice* matter, why, again and again, are we discussing it on the floor of this House? The Constitutional Bench has already been constituted to look into the whole affair, including this judgement, on 6th of March,...(*Interruptions*)... So, can we discuss all these matters? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal) : Yes.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, if you go by the Rule Book, no.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Then, why is it written in the President's Address?...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: What is written there, you read that...(Interruptions)... I want a ruling from the Chair. If the Chair says, 'yes, a *sub judice* matter can be discussed on the floor of this House, then, you can do that...(*Interruptions*)...If not, then, please close it ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Sir, does it mean that judgements cannot be quoted in this House? ...(*Interruptions*)...A judgement is being read...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: No judgement can be *sub judice* ...(*Interruptions*)...I am quoting from the judgement. ...(*Interruptions*)... There is no judgement which is *sub judice*. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: A judgement is not *sub judice* matter...(*Interruptions*)...If a judgement is not allowed to be quoted in this House, it will set a very bad precedent...(*Interruptions*)...I can quote hundreds of judgements...(*Interruptions*)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : चलिए मिस्टर सिब्बल। अब आप इस पार्ट से हटकर दूसरे विषय पर बोलिए।

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : मैं कोट तो करूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : ठीक है। ..**(व्यवधान)**..

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, we can always quote the judgement...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Why are you afraid? ...(*Interruptions*)...This is the law of the land...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Apart from that it is not *sub judice*. This judgement had been passed.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATIOM AND BROADCASTING (SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD): Sir, if you permit me, may I interrupt for a while? Mr. Sibal, will you kindly yield for a moment?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Certainly.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, what Mr. Ahluwalia said is, Mr. Sibal took a pointed offence to a particular observation made by the hon. Prime Minister. His objection was that matter was *sub judice*. If that be the case, I, certainly, don't object to his speaking on the general outlines on the Ayodhya issue, through court verdict or consultations which are there. But, if a particular judgement is being debated that this sets the issue at rest, that raises a question, namely, on 6th March, 2003, the Constitutional Bench is going to have a detailed hearing in which Mr. Kapil Sibal is also appearing in another capacity. That being the scenario, this judgement presently is something which cannot be said very authoritatively. Therefore, Mr. Ahluwalia has a point there, namely, if the entire gamut is soon to be debated on the 6th of March before a Constitutional Bench in which all the parties have to appear, it is completely sub-judice.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : कपिल जी, आप इससे हटकर दूसरे मुद्दे पर आइए । आपने जजमेंट पार्ट को quote कर दिया है ।

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : सर, नहीं किया है । मैं करना चाहता हूं पर करने नहीं दिया मुझे। ....**(व्यवधान)**....

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I want another ruling. Just now from what Mr. Ravi Shankar Prasad has said I came to know, through his version that Mr. Kapil Sibal is also appearing in that case on behalf of one of the parties.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: That is right.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: My question is : Can he place the case in both the places -- in the Apex Court and in the Parliament? Can he make a case? ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir) : Rules do not debar him from doing that ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He has an interest in that. ...*(Interruptions)*... You cannot do that.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Maharashtra) : It is very clear that merely because you are an advocate for a party, it does mean that you are precluded from talking in the House about that matter. But you must tell the House that you are an advocate.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I have said so.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not said that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Incidentally, I am not espousing anybody's cause here. I am not saying this is right or that is right. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I want to quote paragraph 50 of the judgement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : कपिल जी, आप उससे हटकर दूसरे विषय पर आ जाइए, दूसरे प्वाइंट पर आ जाइए । उसमें क्या प्रॉब्लम है ? ....**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : अगर आप उसे नहीं चाहते तो मैं दूसरे प्वाइंट पर आ जाता हूं । ....**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल : आप यह क्यों कहते हैं कि दूसरे विषय पर आ जाइए ? आप पहले स्पष्ट रूलिंग दीजिए । दूसरे प्वाइंट्स पर डिसकशन नहीं हो सकता है । ....**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : सर, क्या मैं जजमेंट quote नहीं कर सकता ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): यह जजमेंट सबको मालूम है ।

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : सबको मालूम नहीं है । ....**(व्यवधान)**... I quote "It is a challenge to the acquisition ..." ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Either he should withdraw these words that Prime Minister has raised this issue, which is *sub-judice* or ...*(Interruptions)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): सिब्बल जी, आप अपने भाषण को कंटीन्यू कीजिए और दूसरे प्वाइंट पर आ जाइए । ....**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी : बाहर ऐसे चलेगा लेकिन अंदर ऐसे नहीं चलेगा । ....**(व्यवधान)**.... He has said something about the judgement...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am not opining one way or the other. I am only stating what the judgement has said and nothing more than that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Sir, he cannot discuss that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, why can't I quote from a judgement? I want a ruling on that. I have a right to quote the judgement. ...*(Interruptions)*...There is no question about it. ...*(Interruptions)*...But this judgement is not even *sub-judice*. What is all this?

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल : सर, आप रूलिंग दे दीजिए तो यह मामला यहीं समाप्त हो जाएगा । ....**(व्यवधान)**....

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, he wants to quote from the judgement. We want to know as to what is there in the judgement. What is the judgement? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, this is what it says, "The challenge to acquisition ..." ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी : सर, ऐसे नहीं चलेगा । ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: In one case, in the case of the Prime Minister, it is sub-judice and in another ... ...*(Interruptions)*...How could it be? ...(Interruptions)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी : ऐसे नहीं चलेगा । ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: How can they stop me from quoting a judgement? ...*(Interruptions)*... Question does not arise.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN (Maharashtra) : We want a ruling whether a judgement can be referred to or not.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: That is all; nothing more than that. I have a right to refer to the judgement. ...*(Interruptions)*... and let me tell you that this judgement is not sub-judice.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : कानून तोड़ने वाले लोग अगर हम पर हावी हो जाएंगे, यह तो कोई मतलब नहीं है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : कपिल जी, कंटीन्यू कीजिए ।

कुमारी मैबल रिबैलो (मध्य प्रदेश): सर, आप उनको बैठने के लिए कहिए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : जजमेंट पढ़ने में कोई प्रॉब्लम नहीं है । As per precedents, he can quote from the judgement. You tell me the rule under which he cannot quote the judgement. You please let me know. ... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: The judgement which is under scrutiny. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: It is not under scrutiny. Who has said that it is under scrutiny? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) : I have gone through as to which matter is *sub judice* or which matter is not *sub judice*. ...[1] *(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: It is not *sub judice*. ...*(Interruptions)* .... जजमेंट कोट करने दीजिए ...**(व्यवधान)**... सर, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: It is *sub judice*. .... *(Interruptions)* ....

उपसभाध्यक्ष : चलिए, चलिए ..**(व्यवधान)**... Come to the other point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: It is not even under review. ... *(Interruptions)* ....

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: You are defying the rule of the Chair. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री एस.एस.अहलुवालिया : आप मुझे क्यो सुना रहे हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी : हां, सुना रहे हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**...नहीं सुनाएंगे क्या ...**(व्यवधान)**...इतना तो सीखा है आपसे ...**(व्यवधान)**...यू आर डिफाइंग चेयर ...**(व्यवधान)**...जब इधर थे ...**(व्यवधान)**...तब सीखा था ...**(व्यवधान)**...अब उधर क्या हो गया है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): No interruptions please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: When the whole matter is *sub judice* ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: It is not. You don't understand what is sub judice and what is not. ...*(Interruptions)*... What can be done? ....*(Interruptions)*...

कुमारी मैबल रिबेलो : चेयर वे है या आप हैं सर ..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री संजय निरुपम (महाराष्ट्र): सबसे पहले आप यह बताइए ..**(व्यवधान)**... इस मुद्दे पर कि ..**(व्यवधान)**...मंदिर बनना चाहिए या नही बनना चाहिए ..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : अदालत कहेगी तो बनना चाहिए ..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री संजय निरुपम : कांग्रेस की भूमिका क्या है ..**(व्यवधान)**...कांग्रेस ने यह कहा है कि ..**(व्यवधान)**... अयोध्या मे मंदिर बनने के दो रास्ते हैं ..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : आप क्यो मंदिर की राजनीति करते हैं ..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री संजय निरुपम : एक तो यह कि दोनो पक्षो के बीच बातचीत हो जाए या कोर्ट इस मामले को सुलझाए ..**(व्यवधान)**.. यह एजेडा है ..**(व्यवधान)**... एन.डी.ए. का..**(व्यवधान)**...एन.डी.ए. के एजेडे पर सहमत नही है ..**(व्यवधान)**...एन.डी.ए. लोगो के साथ बैठकर..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : भई, सुन तो लो जजमेंट .**(व्यवधान)**...सुन तो लो..**(व्यवधान)**... सुन तो लो..**(व्यवधान)**...संजय क्या मैंने कभी आपको इंटरप्ट किया है ..**(व्यवधान)**...सर, यह कोर्ट का जजमेंट है प्लीज..**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री संजय निरुपम : जो भूमिका है ..**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Come to the other point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Let me quote from the judgement, at least. ...*(Interruptions)*...Then, I will not speak. You can have somebody else to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...I cannot be bulldozed by the Members of the other side. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): You may quote the 1994 judgement, which is already known. ...(*Interruptions*)...The House is adjourned for ten minutes.

The House then adjourned at fifty-eight minutes past two of the clock.

The House reassembled at nine minutes past three of the clock,

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU) in the Chair.]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU) The House is adjourned till 3.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned at ten minutes past three of the clock.

The House reassembled at thirty-five minutes past three of the clock,
[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, I have a submission to make.

उपसभापति : अहलुवालिया जी, बोलिए । अभी जरा शांति से सबमिशन सुनिए, उसके बाद मामला सैटल करके हम लोग हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी को थैंक्यू भेज देंगे ।

श्री एस0एस0 अहलुवालिया : महोदया, सदन ऐडजर्न होने से पहले मैं इस मुद्दे पर था, मैंने तीन मुद्दे उठाए थे । पहला, कपिल सिब्बल जी ने राष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण पर बोलते हुए अपने वक्तव्य में कहा था कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने हिमाचल प्रदेश में राम जन्मभूमि के प्रमाणित स्तंभ मिले हैं और वे प्रमाणित हैं, ऐसा कहा है और चूंकि वह मामला सुप्रीम कोर्ट मे सबज्यूडिस है इसलिए उनको उठाना नहीं चाहिए था, ऐसा इन्होंने कहा । इसके तुरंत बाद इन्होंने 1994 की सुप्रीम कोर्ट की एक जजमेंट को क्वोट करने की कोशिश की । मैंने आपत्ति जताई, हमारे कुछ सहयोगी साथियों ने आपत्ति जताई कि अगर प्रधान मंत्री राम जन्मभूमि मंदिर के मामले में कुछ कहते हैं और आप कहते हैं कि वह मामला सबज्यूडिस है तो वह मामला कपिल सिब्बल के मामले में भी सबज्यूडिस है, इसलिए इन्हें भी उसे नही उठाना चाहिए । तीसरी बात, जो हमारे सामने आई, वह यह है कि उसी क्रम में यहां बहस करते वक्त हमारे एक सहयोगी साथी, सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री, श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद, जो इस सदन के सदस्य भी हैं, उन्होंने इंटरवीन किया और बताया कि 6 मार्च को सुप्रीम कोर्ट की जो संवैधानिक पीठ बैठी है इस पर सुनवाई करने के लिए, उसमें इस मसले की भी सुनवाई होगी और माननीय सदस्य श्री कपिल सिब्बल भी किसी पार्टी के लिए उसमें बहस करने वाले हैं । मेरी आपत्ति थी कि अगर एक सदस्य, जो वकील के रूप में कोर्ट में किसी केस पर बहस कर रहा हो और उसी विषय पर सदन में किसी बहस में हिस्सा ले रहा

हो तो बहस में हिस्सा लेने से पहले ही उसे यह जाहिर करना चाहिए कि इस मामले में मैं कोर्ट में भी अपीअर हो रहा हूं, मेरा इसमें इंटरेस्ट इन्वाल्व है ...(व्यवधान)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is correct. ...*(Interruptions)*... He is right. There was a ruling which I gave in the case of Mr. Jethmalani when he was speaking on the Harshad Mehta's case. At that time, Mr. Ahluwalia was in this party, not in that party. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA : No, Madam; I was on this side only.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You were standing there only. He is always in the Opposition! So, he raised the issue. He raised the issue that a person who has an interest in a particular subject as a lawyer or as a retainer should not speak. Then, I requested Mr. Jethmalani, to keep the dignity of the office he was holding in this august House, he should, voluntarily, not speak, so that his speech, or any other Member's speech which is under reference, should not be taken as biased, either for or against anybody, because of a personal interest. That is the reason. The question is, we do not discuss in the House a matter which is *sub judice*. As far as the judgment is concerned, it has not been given yet; the matter is before the Court for decision. Mr. Ahluwalia's objection, when we were discussing it, was that the Prime Minister's speech, which he made, was made outside the House. The Prime Minister speaking in the House is one matter, but the Prime Minister speaking outside the House is a totally different matter. When the Prime Minister speaks in the House and he refers to a thing, a rule which is applied to a Member of the House will also be applied to him. The rule of the House is same for every Member. But what he speaks outside the House, I or the Chairman or the Speaker will have no jurisdiction on that, a speech which either you make or he makes or anybody else makes outside the House. But within the House what is discussed is within certain rules and parameters. ...*(Interruptions)*... *Pradhan Mantri* will also come under the same rule. He is a Member of Parliament. So, the rules which apply to the Members would also apply to him. ...*(Interruptions)*... अभी आप सुन लीजिए, अपनी कमेंटरी बाद में दे दीजिएगा । The main thing here is that there has been some objection to something. I find that it is a judgement which was given in 1994, which is a part of the public document. Now, how one judgement is going to have an impact on the future judgement is a question to be interpreted by the judges or by the lawyers who are appearing this side or that side. The objection was that

Mr. Sibal did not refer to the whole thing; he referred to a part of it. I feel that if he refers to the entire paragraph, there would be no objection.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Not only that, Madam, you must tell him that he should seek an apology from the House for not disclosing his interest. He has not disclosed his interest. He is appearing on behalf of one of the parties on the same judgement in the Supreme Court. How can he do that? How can he plead the case on the floor of the House?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Ahluwalia ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री संजय निरुपम : जरा मुवक्किल को भी .....**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति : मुवक्किल कोई भी हो, I am not interested in him or her. The main thing is that now it is known that he is appearing for somebody in that case. There may be many other lawyers appearing in that case. Perhaps, they may not be Members of this House. The interest of the client is not propagated on the floor of the House. The floor of the House is not used for propagating the interest of his client. That is a different matter. But the thing is that now it is known, and if he is going to quote the entire paragraph, which is a public document, I think, there should be no objection. मंत्री जी, आप कुछ कहना चाहते हैं ? बोलिए ।

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, the ruling is very much there. But I have only one humble submission to make, through you, to the Member. Mr. Sibal should read the judgement in its entirety. But thereafter, he is also to make certain arguments based on that judgement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I have also got a point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me hear him first, please. You will have plenty of points. ...*(Interruptions)*... I don't like any comments from you, please. Would you like me to listen or do you want to sit in the Chair and tackle this issue? ...*(Interruptions)*... Have I said it? Did I say it? Now, please sit down. Please, take your seat. Okay, I will decide. There is no point in being rude to the Chair. Have I ever said that you would not be allowed? Did I say so anywhere? Can you prove it? Why do you pre-empt me? I am asking you.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: They have been disturbing the House for the last half-an-hour. We have been silent spectators.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can't believe that. The main thing is why do you pre-empt that I am going to be biased. Why do you pre-empt? You don't want the matter to be settled.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: I have not said anything. I have not used the word 'biased'.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, I used the word 'biased'. Because you were asking me that is why I said that. When I identify somebody, don't interrupt. When I identify him, you only interrupt.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: I will not be identified at all. I know that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine. If that is what your fate is, it is yours.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, I was only saying that if he reads the judgement, I think, he is going to make certain argument on that. And, I repeat with profoundest respect that (a) if his arguments are the same which he is canvassing there in a different capacity, he has a point and (b) if the argument is something which impinges on the matter which is *sub judice* to be determined on the 6th of March, then the *sub judice* doctrine will apply with full force. That is the only thing I am trying to say. If he reads and sits down, then we have no objection.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not going to put the arguments. Naturally, even if he puts his argument, I am not a judge to give any judgement on what is to be done.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, our objection to *sub judice* remains. That is the only thing what I am saying. कपिल जी, आप बोलिए ।

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Thank you, Madam. I was, in fact, quoting paragraph 50 of the judgement and my good friend Singhal ji said that I

should read the four sentences before what I was going to quote. So, I will read them. "However, at a later stage when the exact area acquired which is needed ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He should tell the House that he has an interest in this case. He has not said that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is a lawyer. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No, Madam, it is not a matter of facts. ...*(Interruptions)*... Madam, what is the ruling? He must disclose his interest. That is the ruling. He must disclose his interest. इतनी तो ईमानदारी बरतें ।

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I have no interest in this case. What is he talking about?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you appearing for somebody?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, May I just make it clear. I am going to reply and I have already replied.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Why is he standing?

उपसभापति : बैठ जाइए । उनको खड़े रहने का शौक है, अभी वे बैठ जाएंगे ।

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Earlier, when a question was put to me, whether on 6th March, I would appear for one of the parties, I said, "Yes". But I am not espousing the case of that party here. I am reading a judgement of the Supreme Court. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He is going to argue the same thing, which he is arguing here, in the court. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, has any Member got the right to hijack the proceedings of the House? ...*(Interruptions)*... You have quoted certain rules of the House to us. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ahluwaliaji, you are doing the same thing, like your other colleagues, pre-empting that what he is going to do. ...(*Interruptions*)... He pre-empted what I am going to do. Let us not presume that such arguments are going to be made. Even if he argues the case here, I am not going to give any judgement on the Babri Masjid issue or Ram Janambhoomi issue or anything. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, I am quoting from a public document....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA : It is a public document. That is why you are allowing him to read it. ...(*Interruptions*)... But if he is making the base of his arguments in the court, the same judgement ...(*Interruptions*)... He is making the base. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I have no personal interest. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There were two points which you had made. ...(*Interruptions*)... Just keep quiet. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please keep quiet. What he said was that he accepted that he would be appearing for someone. He never said no. That is one thing.

SHRI KABIL SIBAL: Madam, I said it earlier.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He said it earlier also. I was not here. Now, before me also he said that he would be appearing for someone. That is it. As far as the paragraph is concerned, he is reading the full paragraph, which is a public document. What he is going to argue in the court, I don't know. Definitely, he is not going to tell us what he is going to argue because his opponent will have a case against him. I don't like this dialogue, discussion and argument on some case which is in the Supreme Court. We are to discuss the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address and our parameters are only that.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Madam, is the ruling in Jethmalani's case is going to be applied here?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That ruling was on the voluntary issue. He voluntarily accepted. ...(*Interruptions*)... I have given my ruling.

डा0 प्रभा ठाकुर (राजस्थान) : उपसभापति महोदया, कृपया इस गतिरोध को समाप्त करें। देश में और भी बहुत बड़ी समस्याएं हैं -भुखमरी है, बेरोजगारी है, गरीबी है। महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में ऐसी अन्य कई बातों का उल्लेख किया है। पूरे सदन का समय वेस्ट किया जा रहा है।...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I fully agree that so much of the time is wasted. It is a lengthy Address and the Members have got a long time, three days, to speak.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, I want to finish it quickly.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You finish it quickly.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, I am quoting from paragraph 15 of the judgement. This is what the Supreme Court says:

> "However, at a later stage, when the exact area acquired which is needed for achieving the professed purpose of acquisition can be determined, it would not merely be permissible but also desirable that the superfluous excess area is released from acquisition and reverted to its earlier owner. The challenge to acquisition of any part of the adjacent area on the ground that it is unnecessary for achieving the object of settling the disputes relating to the disputed area cannot be examined at this stage. But, in case the superfluous area is not returned to its owner, even after the exact area needed for the purpose is finally determined, it would be open to the owner of such property to then challenge the superfluous acquisition being unrelated to the purpose of acquisition."

Then the Supreme Court says in paragraph 57:

> "It is for the larger national purpose of maintaining and promoting communal harmony and in consonance with the creed of secularism... that this adjacent area has been acquired."

Finally, the Supreme Court says in its conclusion and I am reading conclusion Nos. 9 and 10:-

> "That the challenge to acquisition of any part of the adjacent area on the ground that it is unnecessary for achieving the professed object of settling the long-standing dispute, cannot be examined at

this stage. However, the area found to be superfluous on the exact area needed for the purpose being determined on the adjudication of the dispute, must be restored to the undisputed owners."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, now it is over.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: That is what the Supreme Court says. I just rest what is stated by the Supreme Court and say that whatever the Supreme Court has stated is obvious to everybody. I would not like any party to misinterpret what the Supreme Court has said. Now, I will move on to something else.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me see how much time have you already taken for your speech, apart from the time the House was adjourned?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I have just started, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Okay.

श्री संजय निरुपम : अब यह तो बता दीजिए कि ताला किसने खुलवाया ?

उपसभापति : यहां पर मुंह तो खोलने दीजिए, ताला तो बाद में खुलेगा।

श्री संजय निरुपम : मैडम, उस स्ट्रक्चर में राम लला की मूर्ति थी। ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभापति : आप बोलने दीजिए। बड़ी मुश्किल से झगड़ा टला है।

श्री संजय निरुपम : मैडम, इन्होंने तो ताला खुलवाया। अब यह किस बात का विरोध है?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, these whole proceedings, this manner in which I have been interrupted and these objections have reminded our famous poem by Pasteur Niemoller who was the victim of the Nazis and this is what he said, "First, they came for the Jews and I did not speak out because I was not a Jew; Then, they came for the Communist and I did not speak out because I was not a Communist. Then, they came for the Trade Unionists and I did not speak out because I was not a Trade Unionist. Then they came for me and there was no one left to speak out for me ..."

is in this spirit that I stand up here today to speak out because I believe, if I do not speak now, the cherished forefathers, who gave to us this Constitution, will be slowly destroyed by this Government. This Constitution was given to us for what - to make, India into a sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic Republic. And, what are we left with today? Our sovereignty is slowly being bartered by this Government. Our socialism is something they despised. Secularism is the creed ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sibal, I can only say one thing that you did not say. But, the Communist did speak out for you. The Leftist did support you.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : Secularism is the creed they do not understand...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ (Uttar Pradesh) : Did you understand secularism in 1984?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : Secularism is the creed they do not understand and democracy is something, they do not believe in. I wonder what is going to be left of the Republic, if you continue in power.

Madam, let me now come on to another important issue, which relates to the economy of our country. I am referring to paragraph 16 of the President's Address where it has been mentioned that the foreign exchange reserves in this country have crossed US $ 73 billion mark and this is something that this Government have taken pride about, whenever they talk about the development of the economy. As you know, Madam, as far as the foreign exchange reserves are concerned, as far back in August, 2002, the figure was US $ 60 billion and today as this Address says, they are US $ 73 billion. I was trying to figure out as to what the nature of this money is and I made some kind of an analysis in respect of the Balance of Payments relating to the year 2001-02. I came to the conclusion that in the current account of that particular year, there was a balance of US $ 1.3 billion and between the current account and the capital account, the total was US $ 10.8 billion which added on to the reserves. But, perhaps the people of this country do not know that of this US $ 10.8 billion, US $ 4.6 billion represents inflows into the banking capital, namely, the NRIs deposits. Why do I say that? Madam, everybody knows that moneys held by the NRIs abroad fetch a very small rate of interest, *i.e.*, hardly 1-2 per cent. If

those moneys are put in bank deposits in India by the NRIs, the rate of interest is 5 per cent or 6 per cent or 7 per cent.

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ: Is it a new development? This is not a new development. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There should be a rule that nobody should speak without the permission of the Chair, whether sitting or standing. Unfortunately, that is the way the House has evolved itself. I would request the Members to speak when their turn comes. They have enough time to speak. Let Shri Kapil Sibal finish his speech. We have already taken so much time.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Madam, what I was saying was, of this 10.8 billion, 4.6 billion are moneys that are deposited by NRIs in banks in this country only for the purpose of getting a higher rate of interest. The balance amount, almost 3 billion, is short-term portfolio inflow by the foreign institutional investors for the purchase of shares by the non-residents for the simple reason that the stock market is low today, and naturally the FIIs are interested in parking their money in this country. More than 7 billion or 8 billion out of 10.8 billion is the kind of investment which is being made in India. So it is not that the flows which are coming into India are for the purpose of productive investment. It is not those kinds of flows. But this is a hot money which can go back to the NRIs or the FIIs whenever they want. Despite 73 billion dollars, we have an economy which is expanding at a growth rate of 4.4 per cent. So there is a mismatch. Whenever this Government talks about expanding the foreign exchange reserves, it forgets to tell the people of this country that these foreign exchange reserves are indeed not speculated but they are reserves that are not put to use within the country for productive purposes.

There is another aspect in relation to the Tenth Plan that I want to touch upon to which a reference has been made in Para 4. In Para 4 of the President's Address it is stated that the Tenth Plan has set a target of 8 per cent annual GDP during the Plan period with a companion target of five crore additional employment and self-employment opportunities. In respect of the Tenth Plan I want to mention that in order to achieve the growth rate of 8 per cent, the annual investment will have to be stepped up - the Tenth Plan itself says it - to 28.4 per cent of the GDP and the domestic savings

4.00 p.m.

rate has to be stepped up to 26.8 per cent of the GDP from the Ninth Plan level which was 23.4 per cent and the gap which is 1.6 per cent has to be filled up by the Foreign Direct Investment. They are expecting an FDI flow of 7.5 billion dollars every year. What is surprising is that this is what they have planned in terms of the Tenth Plan. What are their real achievements? In 2001-02, the growth rate was 4.5 per cent. It was expected to be almost 6 per cent. There is a negative rate of savings in the public sector which will have to be reduced from 4.5 per cent to 0.5 per cent and the disinvestment receipts which under the Tenth Plan are expected to be at Rs. 78,000 crores, are never going to be achieved. If you look at their record of the disinvestment receipts, they have never crossed the mark of 4 billion. Where from are they going to get this money? The point that I was making originally was that when you talk of a Vision 2020, you must have your feet firm. You cannot dream. You are talking about a country in which, the President Address itself says, there are 260 million people who are living below the poverty line. I would like to talk about the performance of our country. If you compare the performance of India with the performance of China, in the last 20 years, China's GDP has grown at 10 per cent and in the last five years, when they have been in power, India's growth rate has been less than 5.5 per cent. A decade ago, India and China were close to the same per capita income. Today China's per capita income is 900 dollars, roughly twice of India. In 1991, China produced 670 billion kilowatts of electricity. And, today, it produces 1.14 trillion kilowatts. India produces 4.50 billion. China's receipts from tourism have grown to 14 billion, whereas ours are only 3 billion. I can go on and on. In China, manufacturing was about 37 per cent of the economy. Today, that relative wage has increased to 45 per cent. Our manufacturing capacity has reduced, not increased. China's trade in goods and services, as percentage of GDP, grew from 35 per cent to 49 per cent; ours grew from 18 to 30 per cent. They have got 336 billion dollars in foreign investment from 1980 onwards. Ours is only been 18 billion. So, the point is that we do not need to dream; we need to act. We deserve a vision. We should have a vision, but we would want those in the Government to have a vision which is based on reality.

Madam, there is another aspect that I would like to touch upon and that is our judicial system. Madam, in paragraph 58 of the President's Address, there is a reference to our judicial system. Now, what is stated is:

"That judicial delays have been a cause for serious concern and to remedy this situation, 500 crores of rupees have been allocated as special project and upgradation grant for judicial administration." There has been a concerted drive to set up fast track courts. Madam, what is the reality of our times? I would like to refer to a question of 2nd December, 2002, wherein the Government was asked whether the Government have identified ten High Courts of the country having maximum number of Judges and pending cases. And, we find that the number of pending cases in ten top High Courts of the country is just phenomenal, and the Judge strength, as of March, 2002, take the case of Allahabad, it was 95 and it was reduced to 50 and presently, it is only 51. In Madras, the strength is 42. They have only 32 Judges. In Punjab and Haryana, the strength is 40, but they have 26. Now, what is this Government doing about appointment of Judges? I myself asked a question on 9th December, 2002 and I said why don't you appoint an appropriate number of Judges, because in India, the average rate per Judge of one million population is 10.5, whereas in other countries of the world, it is hundred per million population. And, the Government responded by saying that there is an estimated strength of 51,351 Judges that will be required to be in position on the basis of population as per the Census, 2001. And, as per available information, the total number of Judges in position is 15,095. So, you require 51,351 and your strength today is 15,095. How are you going to deal with the issue of delays? And, the President's Address talks about fast track courts, where you do not have Judges to fill vacancies in those fast track courts. And, we keep blaming the judiciary for everything. The fact of the matter is that in the trial court today, a Judge is handling three cases at the same time. Because the files have bludgeoned so much that the Judge does not have the time to handle them. Now, what is the seriousness that this Government is showing about tackling the problem of judiciary, and if the only reference in the President's Address is that we are going to have fast track courts, these courts need Judges and if this is the strength of those Judges, what are those fast track courts going to do? So, this is all rhetoric and this is part of Vision 2020.

In fact, Madam, another subject that I would like to touch upon, now that I have dealt with the judiciary, is the issue of national security. In the Address, in paragraph 7, the President says that the Government has achieved its purpose by showing both, our firmness and self-restraint, in dealing with our hostile neighbour. In fact, I believe that the people of this

country are totally frustrated at the inability of this Government to make Pakistan to see reason and our Government's incapacity to formulate a workable strategy against Pakistan. Troop mobilisation and over-reliance on the United States have both failed. In fact, every day, *ad nauseam*, for the last more than four years, I have been hearing about cross-border terrorism. But, the fact of the matter is: Has cross border terrorism decreased? I remember, when we were having closer ties with the United States, - I am not against that - one of the things that was being stated by Ministers was, "Look, because of this proximity with the United States, we will be able to deal with Pakistan much better and we will be able to reduce cross border terrorism." But the Government has now admitted that there has been no let up in cross border terrorism. In fact, despite September 11 attacks, India's terrorism problem is on the margins of the global war on terror and any terrorist attack on India - and there have been any number of them - has been linked to the Indo-Pak conflict rather than to terrorism. The President has also stated that the Government, after careful deliberation, has decided to strategically re-deploy the armed forces from their positions. I don't understand that. For ten long months, mobilisation took place. It is the largest ever exercise by India, whether in peace or in war - for ten long months! Now, what was the objective achieved? Cross border terrorism continues. Pakistan remains hostile to India. And the U.S. continues to cobble the military dictatorship in Pakistan. What have you achieved? And, in fact, the Operation Parakram took a very heavy toll. Mounting a full military threat without a political will to carry the troops is at the cost of our credibility both at home and abroad. In fact, August-September, 2002, saw an increase in infiltration. It is only in the months of October-November that there was a small decline. And there is no change in Pakistan's position and approach towards cross border terrorism. The fact of the matter is that the Government is unable to take any firm decision - whether it was an attack of the Kashmir Assembly in October, or, an attack on Parliament on December 13 or for that matter, the seige of the Raghunath Mandir or the Akshardham temple. What did we do except talk? Now, we keep on telling the United States, "Declare Pakistan as a terrorist State". They haven't even responded to these talks, to these public statements. Advaniji, the other day, I remember, when Mr. Putin took a strong posture on the Chechenyan terrorist attacks in the theatre, said, "Look, this shows that Russia is not a soft State." And that is the kind of position and posture you must have got. But what did you do when IC-814 was hijacked? I must say, even the latest war that we fought with Pakistan was fought on our

territory, and the Kargil Report stands as one of the biggest cover-up operations that post-Independence India has ever seen. In fact, after December 13, the United States has helped put Pakistan's F-16 fighter jet fleet back in full service through the supply of badly needed replacement parts. Talking about the nuclear doctrine in our country, -- now, they say, "We have put in place a comprehensive nuclear doctrine" -- almost every day they export terrorism; they export 'jihad' and they blackmail us with their nuclear bombs. Ultimately, the only answer to this solution is to de-nuclearise Pakistan because Pakistan will continue to support terrorists, continue to control those terrorists and threaten India. And as far as they are concerned, they have set up a command system. And their command system was set up three years ago, and it is a single-window decision-making process. It is integrated with its nuclear weapons and its war-fighting strategy. It took us five long years to set up a civilian-led nuclear command, which is according to me a cumbersome body because it has to be supported by political council and executive council and there is a strategic, separate strategic, forces command for the military which has to provide inputs. These several entities, which are part of the decision-making process will have to be refined by us. And we will also have to develop a single-window decision-making process, but I am afraid that Pakistan will continue to export terror and play nuclear poker with us. As far as our doctrine of deterrence is concerned, I want to say that India should add greater flexibility to its nuclear posture. We must assert that our nuclear red line would be crossed once Pakistan begins loading of bomb on a war-plane or making a warhead with a missile. We should have a flexible 'No First Use' approach not just a 'No First Use Approach'. I say a flexible 'No First Use Approach', because it is better to avert a nuclear attack than to respond to one.

Madam, having said that, I just want to conclude by making a very brief statement on disinvestment. Many debates have taken place in this House on disinvestment. Unfortunately, none of the points -- raised by the Members of the Opposition -- has been answered. But the one issue, which I want to raise, which concerns us, is that the whole process of disinvestment in this country has been reduced to giving away valuable national assets at throw- away prices on a principle of discounted cash flow. The fact of the matter is that most of these enterprises, which are ultimately given away, are standing on valuable real estate. And properties, which are worth crores of Rupees, are being given away for a pittance.

Nobody minds money coming into kitty through the process of disinvestment, which has a productive end result. Whether it is hotels or it is anything else, you are going to give them away at throw-away prices to some favoured buyers and then not using that money, whatever little you get out of it. By retiring the public debt and putting it in as a part of your revenue expenditure, what you are doing in the process is frittering away valuable assets and not putting them to productive use. You cannot, through this process allow institutional loot, and name it as 'disinvestment'. And I think the time will come when this dispensation will change and the facts will come to light, as to how this kind of institutional loot was allowed for the most favoured buyers. Madam, having said that, I am sorry that this unfortunate and unsavoury interruption took place. I have no intent to raise any disputed issue. I only wanted to place on record a fact of the judgement and how, despite the judgement, the atmosphere in India is sought to be vitiated, mainly because an election is round the corner. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Shahid Siddiqui, you have only two minutes left of your party's time.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): अभी तो सात मिनट हैं ।

उपसभापति : दो मिनट हैं, हमारा रिकार्ड है ।

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI : This is my maiden speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: हमारे लोग बराबर हिसाब रखते हैं, सैक्रेटेरिएट का कोई इंटरेस्ट नहीं होता। They have written only two minutes. Maiden speech is fine but it cannot take away House's rules. I will call you a little later. First, Mr. C.P. Thirunavukkarasu will speak and then I will allow you, because you are the second speaker. You are not the first one. I just wanted to remind you of that.

SHRI C. P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU (Pondicherry): Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairman, for having permitted me to speak on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Madam, the Address speaks about various subjects, from finance to foreign countries, education to eradication of poverty, population control to fertilisers and sugar industry to security interests. The Address of the hon. President gives the achievements of the

Government. It also talks about the future prospects. I want to state that the Address has taken into consideration various aspects like socialism, sovereignty, security and democracy. I want to mention one point with respect to paragraph 54 about social justice. It has been mentioned in paragraph 54: "Promotion of social justice and mainstreaming of the weaker sections and minorities has been the constant endeavour of my Government". In this connection, I want to say that Tamil Nadu has done a pioneering work in the field of social justice. It was in the year 1922 that we had provided for reservation for the Backward Classes, the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, in the Government colleges. In 1956, reservation was done through a Government Order. There was a lot of agitation in Tamil Nadu. A case was filed in the Supreme Court and the Government Order was set aside by the court saying that there should not be any reservation for the Backward Classes, the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. Because of this judgment, a lot of riots took place; almost a revolution took place in Tamil Nadu. Periyar, Anna, Kalaingar and Kamraj participated in this revolution. Ultimately, at the intervention of Shri Kamraj, Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru brought an amendment brought in the Constitution saying that there should be reservation for the Backward Classes. Madam, recently the Supreme Court has delivered another judgment in T. A. Pai's case. In that case, it has been mentioned that self-financing engineering and medical colleges need not follow any reservation policy and that they can collect any amount as capitation fee, and any amount as fee for their colleges. This has created a lot of difficulties as far as Tamil Nadu is concerned. The people of Tamil Nadu are agitating. In the name of self-financing colleges and institutions, these colleges are looting the people.

Madam, originally, it was called the Education Department. Now, it is called the Department of Human Resource Development. Human resources are being exploited by these self-financing colleges. All the political parties in Tamil Nadu are agitating. I would like to say that as far as the Government colleges are concerned, only 6,000 students can get admission. The remaining 50,000 students have to take admission in private colleges. Now, about 40,000 Backward Class/SC/ST students study in self-financing colleges. If this judgment is implemented as it is, there is no possibility of any Backward Caste/SC/ST student getting admission in these colleges. The whole reservation policy will be shattered. There might be another revolution taking place in Tamil Nadu, demanding reservation for the

Backward Classes, the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. So, the Government should take immediate steps. As far as the self-financing colleges are concerned, there should be reservation of seats so far as candidates belonging to Backward Classes/SCs/STs are concerned. Otherwise, there will be lot of commotion and agitations in Tamil Nadu.

So far as the foreign policy is concerned, I would like to make a few remarks. Madam, we have good relations with the other countries. Our country is stable because the hon. Prime Minister has taken adequate steps to protect India's interests. In the year 1990-91, Shri I.K. Gujral went to Baghdad. At that time, there was a quarrel between Iraq and a neighbouring country. During his visit to Iraq, he had a good dialogue with the Iraqi President. Subsequently, Shri Chandrasekhar's Government was formed. Then, an American plane came to India and was refuelled in India. What happened then? A sort of calamity happened. More than 3 lakh Indians who were working there were asked to go out of that country. They actually took the plane for their own country. This is a record in the Guinness Book, as it is. Now, our Prime Minister has taken sufficient steps to protect the people who reside in the Gulf region. He has said in remarkable words that 'the Super power should be super-restrained'. Because of these words, which the Prime Minister has said in India, about 3.5 million people who work in the Gulf have been saved. They are sending about Rs.28,000 crores to India, half of the amount sent to the mother country by NRIs. About Rs.28,000 crores have been sent to India and India is now in a happy position, as far as our foreign exchange position is concerned. Taking into consideration this fact, India is in a safe position.

Madam, as far as Bangladesh is concerned, about 16 million migrants are living throughout the country. They have infiltrated into the country and living in different parts of the country. We have bothered about 213 snake charmers alone and we have not bothered about these 16 million migrants who have entered in India. Actually, the Bangladeshis are now in a position to make all sorts of infiltration in India and they are acting against the interests of Indian community. Recently, a women football match between the Indian football team and a Bangladesh club was not allowed to be played. They were prevented from playing football at a particular place. Fashion shows organised by the Indian community have been prevented from being held. Even television channels of India have been refused to be screened in a particular area. The Bengal New Year festival which is to be

organised in Bangladesh, I understand, was prevented from being organised, as it is. Begum Zia and *Jamat-e-Islami,* both of them are preventing it. So, these sorts of things are happening in Bangladesh. About 4053 kilometres of border with Bangladesh is likely to be fenced. Only 2000 kilometres has been fenced so far. The remaining part has not been fenced. For that area, BSF security should be provided. The remaining 2000 kilometres has to be fenced, as it is. The Government of India should take immediate steps in this regard.

Madam, as far as the Judiciary is concerned, I am happy to note that it has been dealt with in paragraph 58 of the President's Address. It says, "Judicial delays have been a cause for serious concern. To remedy this situation, nearly Rs.500 crore have been allocated as special project and upgradation grant for judicial administration. This is the largest investment ever made for this purpose." I would like to say with great respect that the fast track courts are functioning properly. But, more special drives have been made to fill about 2000 vacant posts of judges and magistrates. Appointment of judges will not solve the problem of disposing cases. I would like to quote one paragraph from the *Tribune*. It says, "During the last three years, it has become a fashion to draw superficial comparison with the USA. In the USA, at present, there are 29000 judges, including the part time judges, which makes it approximately 111.5 judges per million of population as compared to India which has 13000 judges for a population of 1050 million - 12.4 judges per million of population. No doubt number of judges per million of population is nine times in the USA but the crime is 29 times as compared to India and so also the total filings.

In 1999, as many as 93.81 million cases, both criminal and civil, were instituted in various US courts against 12.84 million in this country. Per judge filings in US courts were as high as 3235 as compared to 987 in India. *Prima facie* the statistics indicate that efficiency of US judges is 327 per cent as compared to Indian judges. Actual workload of American judges will be much higher when adjustment is to be made for part time judges." My submission before this august House is, the number of judges is not important but the quality of judges is more important and then only they can dispose of a large number of cases. Comparison of the American system will not solve the problem. We should have more number of judges to dispose of pending cases.

I would like to stress one more point before this august House. In 1992-93, about Pondicherry, it has been mentioned in the Estimates Committee, "In order to make Legislative Assembly, the Committee desires that powers may be delegated to this body in a far liberal manner as that has been done hitherto." They also recommended that in the case of difference of opinion between the Lt. Governor and the Legislative Council, the views of the elected representatives should prevail, except in matters of national security, law and order and such other important areas. The Union Territories Act, in 1944 prescribed that the will of the administrator is more important than the Council of Ministers, the Council of Ministers is only advisory; whatever advice is given to the Administrator, the Administrator can even turn it down and he can take an independent decision.

As early as in 1992-93 itself, the Estimates Committee had made specific recommendations, saying that there should be an amendment to the Union Territories Act and by virtue of that amendment, the administrative bodies should be given more powers and that the words of the Council of Ministers should be taken into consideration rather than the Administrator. So far, no amendments have been made in the Union Territories Act. Though we have crossed more than 12 years, still, it is only on paper. Though the U.T. of Pondicherry has taken the form of a Legislative body, though there are Ministers, the recommendations have not been taken into consideration. I request the Government to make an amendment with regard to this particular aspect.

Now, a word about the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is a fine Prime Minister. He is having a dream of turning India into a developed country. In his dream, he has the Golden Quadrilateral Project, covering 6,000 Kms, costing Rs.54,000 crores; the National Power Grid, at a cost of Rs.80,000 crores; Inter-linking of River Waters, at a cost of Rs.5,60,000 crores; and the Sky Bus Metro, costing Rs.25,000 crores. The dream is good and I am sure, it would come true.

I have a submission with regard to Tamil Nadu. Tamil Nadu had collected one crore signatures, from different parties and from different corners of the State and presented a memorandum to the Prime Minister, urging him to take steps for the release of Mr. Vaiko. He was a Member of this House for a period of 18 years; he is a Member of the Lok Sabha for six years. The first signature of the memorandum is that of our leader,

Dr. Karunanidhi, urging the Prime Minister to take immediate steps for the release of Mr. Vaiko from detention. In spite of that, the Government has not taken any steps for his release from custody.

There is a point related to this. Section 60 of the Prevention of Terrorism Act deals with the things as follows:

"60(1) The Central Government and each State Government shall, wherever necessary, constitute one or more Review Committees for the purposes of this Act.

(2) Every such Committee shall consist of a Chairperson and such other members not exceeding three and possessing such qualifications as may be prescribed."

My submission is, as per section 60 of the Act, the Government of India can, and should have, formed a committee. I don't know whether such a committee has been formed till today or not. If they have not formed one, they are bound to form it under section 60(1) of the Act. This committee is Review Committee for every detention. If the detention is illegal, if the detention is unwarranted, if the detention is vindictive, if the detention is based on political motive... They should review the matter and take necessary steps not only in the case of Vaiko but also for all the people in India who have been unnecessarily detained in jails. I believe, the Government of India has not taken any steps by virtue of section 61 of the Act and has not appointed a Review Committee so far. If this Review Committee is appointed, the wishes of one crore people of the country, who have signed this memorandum will be taken into consideration by the Government of India. So, I request the Government of India to take earnest steps to see that the persons who have been detained unnecessarily on political grounds or due to political vendetta are released from jails. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN (Nominated): Madam Deputy Chairman, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. Madam, I congratulate the Mover of the Motion of Thanks, my distinguished and hon. friend, Dr. L.M. Singhvi for a fine eloquent speech which has set the level of debate. However, Madam, permit me to draw attention to a couple of significant points and comment on them. They are significant and most relevant points in these times to governance in our country.

The first significant point is the complete omission in the President's Address about any policy of this Government with regard to violence and perpetrators of violent acts, whoever they be and wheresoever they are seen perpetrating them.

It is true that the President's Address does state that 'we must resolve to ensure that communal violence is never repeated in any part of the country.' But that is an exhortation to the people of India. There is no signal which only the Executive Government at the Centre can give, that all acts of violence by whomsoever committed and wheresoever they take place, will be put down with a firm hand.

Madam, messages are frequently conveyed by silence, and the silence about this in the President's Address sends the wrong message, such as if you have the right political connections, we will look the other way. This is not good for governance in a pluralistic society like ours.

Secondly, there is no word of solace in the President's Address for the victims of violence, whether communal or otherwise -- this is very important -- nor any assurance of early redress.

The arrogance of religious hatred goes uncontrolled and unpunished primarily because those appointed to investigate these events are as yet calling no one to account.

It appears to me that in Gujarat it is not despite the appointment by the State Government of a Commission of Inquiry - but because of it, that injustice continues to remain the looming casualty of the Godhra and post-Godhra tragedies.

In the very first sentence of paragraph 14 of the President's Address it is stated that Assembly elections in Gujarat have strengthened democracy. Good, they have.

But then it goes on to say that elections have ended 'a sad chapter in the State's history.' Madam, the sad chapter has not ended. It will not end so long as no redress is given to the victims of the violence that preceded the elections.

A clear declaration of Government policy that communal violence whether by minority communities or by the majority community will never be tolerated, and must never be repeated in any part of the country is, I believe, the need of the hour. It is only such a clear declaration that will send the right signals to all persons in the country.

Let me remind the hon. Members of first sentence in paragraph 54. It says, "Promotion of social injustice and mainstreaming of the weaker sections and the minorities have been the constant endeavour of my Government." Mainstreaming of minorities is contrary to the Constitutional mandate. Minorities do not require mainstreaming. They require protection, and the persons who can protect them and the only authority to whom they can look for protection, is the Government of the day.

I looked closely but did not find anything in the President's Address to suggest that the Government of the day has distanced itself from current constant threats to minorities whether they be Muslims or Christians, by certain sections of the population. It is the Government's duty to gain confidence of the minorities and let me hasten to add, it is equally the duty of the minorities to do everything in their power and to see that the majority community is not, in any way, ridiculed or belittled.

The President's Address devoted a paragraph to judicial reforms and has mentioned that this is envisaged in the Tenth Five Year Plan. Dr. Singhvi said that we must give the judicial system a human face. Now, what is the use of judicial reforms that don't ensure justice? Where is the human face of justice, In a country where an individual is told that he has violated the Official Secrets Act by being in possession of a secret document, kept in jail for more than six months, and then told that the document was not secret, after all, and set free. Any one can commit mistakes. So can the Government. But no one, just no one, after the mistake was discovered, has apologised to the individual concern -- much less to offer him any substantial compensation for what was admittedly a wrongful confinement. If he were a citizen of a European country, the European Court of Human Rights would have awarded compensation, in a handsome sum of hundreds of thousands of Euros. I have been in Delhi now for more than thirty years and if there is one trait in the Northen India that I have noticed is no one apologises. No one says sorry! But, I did not realise, till now, that even the Central Government in Delhi is afflicted with this malignant disease.

I welcome the paragraph in the Address that the Ayodhya dispute can be resolved, either through negotiations between the two communities or through a verdict of the judiciary, which has to be accepted by all concerned. I believe it is a statesman-like approach. I would, sincerely, appeal to the hon. leaders of the minority community to envisage a possible situation of the verdict of the judiciary going against them. Have they ever considered that possibility? What will they do then? Prudence points to the path of a negotiated settlement. That is the only lasting way to communal peace. There is no dearth of eminent religious and social leaders to bring about a solution and pride has no place in negotiating an honourable settlement.

Finally, there is one more important aspect. In the spirited address of Dr. Singhvi, on the Motion of Thanks, he has rightly described Parliament as not a mere 'talking-shop' or 'debating club' but as 'the national forum of our conscience and consensus.' Very eloquent words.

I only wish that the Government of the day had lived up to this ideal. Parliamentary democracy is a very important facet of our Constitution. In fact, it is the cornerstone of it. But, I regret to say that the reluctance of the Government to discuss crucial and controversial matters in the House, and taking decision administratively on its own is fast becoming a new feature of governance in this country. We, in this House, are, in fact, reduced to a 'talking-shop' or 'debating club' -- and the most expensive one at that.

I offer, as an example, the disinvestment policy of the Government. I have no quarrel with the disinvestment policy. I personally do not think that the Government should engage in business and Article 298 of our Constitution, I believe, is only enabling -- carrying on business is not one of the essential functions of the Government. Nor do I raise any question about the legality of executive action taken on the recently proposed disinvestment. When this question was raised in this House, during the last Session, the hon. Leader of the Opposition requested the hon. Minister to take the opinion of the Attorney General, which he has now taken and has acted on that opinion. And, so far as this House is concerned, I believe, the matter must rest there. Since we must respect the Office of the Attorney General, as we must respect all the Constitutional offices in this country. But, I am concerned with the propriety of action taken on the

basis of the opinion of the Attorney General. Legality is not the only facet of governance. Propriety is an equal, if not more important, facet. Just as corporate democracy requires that even when decisions can lawfully be taken by a company's Board of Directors, it is but proper that it should be placed before the shareholders of that company for their approval. So also, vital national policy decision on disinvestment, even if already taken, should have been, as a matter of propriety, placed before the Members of Parliament, including the Members of this House, for their approval. It could only then be effectively discussed and debated. And, the hon. Minister of Disinvestment is amply endowed with powers of persuasion. He could help persuade and convince us to accept his proposal. The studied reluctance of the Government of the day to bring controversial matters to Parliament is slowly eroding the principles of Parliamentary democracy. Bypassing Parliament on vital issue of policy is a bad precedent and does not augur well for the future. Madam, comparisons with China are odious simply because we do not have the same political system as in China. If we were in China, there would have been no debate on disinvestment; there would have been no debate on Ayodhya; there would have been no debate on the President's Address. I may not agree with what this Government does or does not do. But, I think, we should all agree that this system of Government in our Constitution gives us the largest measures of freedom. With these few reservations, I have joined the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Madam, I reiterate what my colleague Shri Fali S. Nariman has said. When he says that Parliament is the supreme body, the supreme forum of national consensus, I agree. The President's Address, as we know, is really a Government document. I have high respect, regard and affection for the President. But, as we all know, the President only reads the Address, which is really a document of the Government. This President's Address, perhaps the longest ever, looks more like a PIB release with all types of so-called achievements, big or small. But behind this, it does hide the fundamentals of the Government's policy, and this governance which is divisive, not merely in terms of religion. We all know that it is divisive in terms of religion. But in a very insidious way. It is also divisive, as far as the social and economic status of people are concerned. It divides people in terms of religion, we all know. It also divides the rich and the poor, the 'haves' and 'have-nots', the socially high and the socially low. On the one hand, the Government is dividing the

people of this country, destroying the national unity; on the other hand, it is opening wide the doors of this country and its economy, not in great shape, to the intents of the profit-making multinational corporations and the Governments behind them. This is happening in India. This is happening in every country of Asia, Africa and Latin America, at this point of time. What we object to, is that this Government is helping and welcoming the efforts at profit making by the trans-nationals in everything because people in Developing Countries do not really count, even in the spheres of human rights of people, fundamental human rights of people, as far as in the case of education or as far as health is concerned. Now, this grabbing and profit-making, which looks at every thing as only a business and an opportunity for trans-nationals who have been allowed entry here and welcomed by the Government. All this is being kept under wraps. Therefore, I would just point out here what I have said with reference to this very important basic subject which leads to the thought process of people, which will decide the future of this country, that is, Education. If you look at this book, National Curriculum Framework for School Education, which has been produced by the Government itself, you will find a clear reference to an educational system that has a dual role. That you will find at page 11. It says, "There must be a system of education for those with high IQ and emotional quotient." The IQ is a criteria, which had been started in the United States, and has been debunked there. The United States wanted to give, what we would call in India a non-formal or alternative education, to the blacks on the ground that they had inferior IQ. Here, in India, we have added 'emotional quotient' to the 'intelligence quotient'. The 'emotional quotient', which is the creation of this Government, means that those students, who have a high spirituality, must be given a special and higher education. Who have a high spirituality? Those who don't have to work have a high spirituality. The working class cannot afford to have a high spirituality. They are busy earning their livelihood. Therefore, that is how, this new curriculum framework divides the social elites from the working class. Madam, Deputy Chairman, to further elaborate the point, I would like to refer to page 90 of this book. It says that whilst those with high Intelligence quotient and emotional quotient will get elite education, the rest would get vocational education. And, who are the people targeted to get vocational education? They are: the women, the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and the physically-challenged persons. So, all these people, put together, are to be imparted vocational training. And those with high spiritual quotient should get elite education. This is how, at the very

beginning itself, two classes are being created for children and this is how the gap between the elite and the poor masses is being widened. This is how divisiveness is being created in the social and economic status of this country.

We all know, how this Government depends for its survival, for its progress on dividing people, on religious lines. This is what is being written in the textbooks that follow the national curriculum. To begin with, I shall first refer to this great textbook in Social Sciences, named, 'Contemporary India', brought out only a couple a months ago, for students of class IX. In this book, there was no reference, whatsoever, to the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi by Godse. The point had been completely left out. In this textbook, the minorities of our country, especially, the Muslims and the Christians, have been defined as anti-nationals, and that they played no role in the Freedom Struggle of our country. It is even mentioned that the founder of the Aligarh Muslim University was a communal element and he was a separatist. This is mentioned in Chapter 3, page 21 onwards of this book.

Incidentally, I would like the officials of this Government to please look at the edition of this book. This book has two joint editions. One is August, 2002 edition and the other is September, 2002 edition. On both these books it is mentioned, 'first edition'. How can a book have two first editions? This is something which I am unable to understand. There is another an August, 2002 edition, which I am now referring to. Then, there is September, 2002 edition, on which it is mentioned that it is the first reprint of October. All this is very confusing. The officials in the department must inquire into this. They also look at the number of print orders given. For the first edition of September, 2002, a print order of 3,75,000 has been given and for the August, 2002, edition 2,25,000 print orders were placed. That makes a total of 6,00,000 copies. For whom so many copies have been printed? In the previous years, never have so many copies been printed for Class IX Social Sciences students. It has never gone beyond 2.5 lakhs. Why were so many English copies published this year? The number of English and Hindi copies taken together would be more. But, for the present, let us keep the number of Hindi copies aside. Why were so many English copies published? The matter is questionable because the main user of this book, the Delhi Government, and many private schools, had refused to use that book. There is hanky-panky in this. There is something fishy in this. The Department should look into this.

The point which however I would like to highlight here is the way this textbook communalises the situation. While communalising, it also gives wrong facts, historically. For instance, it is mentioned that Goa, Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli were, collectively, called Goa. It is like saying, during the British Rule, India was called Delhi because the Government was based in Delhi. This is the type of historical and factual inaccuracies given in this book. Not only that... (*Interruptions*)... they also glorify things. In this book, there is a reference to communal Muslim and Christian organisations and their anti-national activities. But, as far as other communities are concerned there were no communal elements. On page 61, it is mentioned that Dadra and Nagar Haveli was captured by the Jan Sangh. This is totally against history. The Chief Minister of the then Bombay State, went on to become the Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai. In Volume II of "The Story of my Life", written by Shri Morarji Desai, at pages 47-49, it has been written, how he had directed the Reserve Police to encircle Dadra and Nagar Haveli, so that Portuguese troops did not come. Then, it has been written, when the Portuguese police officers which were four or five in number, saw the Reserve Police which looked like a military force, they did not attack and ran away into the adjacent forests. There was no fight whatsoever. No fighting took place. That is what Mr. Morarji Desai said. Why do you want to glorify Jan Sangh on wrong facts? I am sure that Jan Sangh has done some good, but not this. This is what the historians should really advert to. There are people who know the facts. There are people who were part of this process and were fully aware of it. (*Time bell rings*) Madam, please give me five minutes to make some important points.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Faleiro, a lot of time has been taken. We have to accommodate all the speakers.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, that is true.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are taking the time of your Party speakers.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, I just want to say that this Government is trying to divide the country on social, economic and religious basis. On the other hand, it is welcoming all the trans-national corporations which are trying to gobble up our educational system. Until 2002, in fact,

until 14th January, 2002, the position was that, at school level, no student could have foreign schooling unless he was a son or daughter of a diplomat or a foreigner, or her or she who had intended to pursue a course which was not available in India. Now, after 14th January, 2002, anybody, whosoever it may be, can take up here at school level itself, any course abroad. All the big talk of the hon. Minister about Indianisation, spiritualisation and nationalism is meaningless. Now, for a student, who wants to do any course from Britain, or France or America, nobody's permission is required to be taken. That thing has been waived. Therefore, again, we are going to create, in this country, two classes of people. One, who have their education from foreign countries, even at the school level here and the others who have their education - third rate education - at the schools, the Government is providing in the name of informal education. The more we abuse Pakistan, the more we are following their system, because this system is prevailing there. There also the elite people have their education in the Western model and the rest have their education in *Madrasas*. Even in my own State, Government has closed Primary Schools and handed them over to Vidya Bharati. This is being done at a time when Pakistan and Afghanistan, which have their educational system on fundamentalist group basis, are trying to become more liberal. This is what appears to be happening. We are, tragically, following the reverse mood, that is, moving from secularism to communalism, while it appears from the reports, that in Afghanistan and Pakistan people are trying to move, to some extent, however limited it might be, from a fundamentalist type of education to a liberal education. (*Time bell rings*) I just want to say this and conclude ; At this point of time the Ministry of Human Resource Development and the Ministry of Commerce are busy preparing proposals for opening our education system to foreign business concerns. The Government should inform this House what they intend to do next month at GATS. It should take the consensus of this House, because GATS is an irreversible process. It cannot be reversed by future Governments. GATS process is not subject to Indian courts. It is subjected to their own courts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you referring to GATS or WTO?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am referring to GATS. I have found one Vice-Chancellor who does not know what GATS is all about. This is because of secrecy. And you should not be surprised if we don't know what GATS is. GATS is a General Agreement on Trade in services which is part or a branch, a follow-up of WTO. The Government must discuss this

issue in this House. It should inform the House what it intends to do next month in terms of commitments and opportunities available under GATT in the field of education and health. The Government must withdraw the book "National Curriculum Framework for School Education" which is divisive and destroys the unity of the country for now and for the generations to come.

श्री अजय माकन (झारखंड): माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, मैं माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी के संबोधन के लिए, उनके प्रति धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं । मुझे बेहद खुशी है कि संसद के समक्ष माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी के प्रथम अभिभाषण पर मुझे विचार व्यक्त करने का मौका मिला है ।

सर्वप्रथम मैं अपनी ओर से भी कल्पना चावला को श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करता हूं । माननीय प्रधान मंत्री, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के कुशल नेतृत्व में सरकार ने राजनीतिक आर्थिक व कूटनीतिक मामलों मे अभूतपूर्व उपलब्धियां हासिल की हैं । माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने इन्हीं का विवरण पेश किया है और उसके लिए उनके प्रति मैं आभार व्यक्त करता हूं ।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने ठीक ही कहा है कि राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा सरकार के लिए सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता का विषय है । पाकिस्तान खुले तौर पर आतंकवाद का समर्थन कर रहा है और उसका इरादा हमारे देश में बदअमनी पैदा करने का है । मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी और उनकी सरकार को बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि उन्होने हालात का बहुत कुशलता से सामना किया है । एक तरफ पाकिस्तान को यह बता दिया गया है कि भारतीय सेनाएं किसी भी स्थिति का सामना करने को तैयार हैं, वहीं दूसरी ओर सारी दुनिया को संदेश दिया गया है कि हम लड़ाई नहीं चाहते और बहुत मजबूरी में ही युद्ध करेंगे । यह एक बड़ी कूटनीतिक सफलता है । मैं यहां अपने कुछ मित्र देशों के रवैये का भी उल्लेख करना चाहूंगा । अफसोस की बात है कि हमारे कुछ मित्र देश आतंकवाद के मामले में दोहरी नीति अपना रहे हैं । पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ हमारी सरकार ने अनेक सबूत पेश किए । भारतीय संसद पर हमला, गुजरात के अक्षरधाम मंदिर पर हमला और जम्मू के रघुनाथ मंदिर पर हमले में पाकिस्तान का स्पष्ट हाथ था, फिर भी पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ कार्रवाई नहीं की जा रही है । आज पाकिस्तान विश्व शांति के लिए इराक से भी बड़ा खतरा है । इसलिए जो राष्ट्र इराक के खिलाफ कार्रवाई करने का मन बना रहे हैं, उन्हें पहले पाकिस्तान को रास्ते पर लाना चाहिए तभी दुनिया से आतंकवाद समाप्त होगा । हम सबको यह भी समझ लेना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान प्रायोजित आतंकवाद का खात्मा हमें अपने बलबूते पर ही करना होगा और हम किसी अन्य पर भरोसा नहीं रख सकते तथा इस ओर हमारी सरकार कार्य कर रही है एवं हमें भरोसा है कि सरकार उसमें कामयाब होगी ।

आतंकवाद की तरह उग्रवाद भी एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है । मेरे प्रदेश झारखंड में यह उग्रवाद गंभीर रूप लेता जा रहा है । मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार का आभारी हूं कि पुलिस आधुनिकीकरण योजना के लिए वह राज्यों को पर्याप्त आर्थिक सहायता दे रही है । मेरा अनुरोध है कि उग्रवाद से निपटने के लिए झारखंड जैसे राज्य को भी विशेष सहायता दी जाए । पुलिस बलों को प्रशिक्षण देने के लिए विशेष प्रबंध किए जाने की आवश्यकता है क्योंकि उग्रवादी अत्याधुनिक हथियारों से लैस हैं ।

5.00 p.m.

हाल में गुजरात के विधान सभा चुनावों को शांतिपूर्वक कराए जाने से लोकतंत्र को मजबूती प्राप्त हुई है और वहां की सरकार को बदनाम करने की सभी कोशिशें बेकार साबित हुई हैं । राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने सम्बोधन में भी उसका उल्लेख किया है कि विधान सभा चुनावों ने लोकतंत्र को मजबूत किया है । राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने सम्बोधन में स्पष्ट किया है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी और उप प्रधान मंत्री जी तो कई बार कह चुके हैं कि सरकार पंथनिरपेक्षता के लिए प्रतिबद्ध है और देश में अल्पसंख्यकों के हितों को वह पूरी तरह से सुरक्षित रखेगी । खेद की बात है कि इस मुद्दे को अनावश्यक रूप से राजनीतिक रंग दिया जा रहा है । मैं आपके माध्यम से सभी विपक्षी दलों से अपील करूंगा कि साम्प्रदायिक सद्भाव को राजनीति का मुद्दा न बनाया जाए और वे इस मामले में सरकार को सहयोग दें ।

जैसाकि राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा कि अयोध्या विवाद को या तो दोनों समुदायों के बीच वार्ता द्वारा सुलझाया जा सकता है अथवा न्यायपालिका के निर्णय से सुलझाया जा सकता है। सरकार चाहती है कि न्यायपालिका को अपना कार्य तीव्रता से करके इस बारे में शीघ्र अपना निर्णय देना चाहिए । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब भी सरकार इस मामले को सुलझाने के लिए कोई पहल करती है तो विपक्ष के हमारे कुछ मित्र आसमान को सर पर क्यों उठा लेते हैं ? ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए । मैं सदन के सभी पक्षों से अपील करना चाहता हूं कि अयोध्या मसले को सद्भाव और सहमति के वातावरण में सुलझाने में वे पूरा सहयोग दें ।

उपसभापति महोदया, आर्थिक मोर्चे पर भी वाजपेयी सरकार ने कई उपलब्धियां हासिल की हैं । जहां तक विदेशी मुद्रा भंडार का प्रश्न है, अभी-अभी पूर्ववक्ता, माननीय श्री कपिल सिब्बल जी ने कहा कि हमारे देश में 73 बिलियन अमरीकी डालर का भंडार है । लेकिन इसमें बहुत अधिक राशि NRIs से प्राप्त होती है क्योंकि वहां पर उनको ब्याज की दर कम मिलती है । इसलिए वे यहां पर उस रकम को इन्वैस्ट कर रहे हैं । यह स्थिति पहले भी थी । अब इस सरकार पर NRIs को ज्यादा भरोसा हो गया है । इसलिए वे यहां पर इन्वैस्ट कर रहे हैं ।

महोदया, राष्ट्रपति जी ने एक अप्रैल से लागू होने वाली VAT प्रणाली का उल्लेख किया है । उन्होंने आशा ज़ाहिर की है कि इस प्रणाली से कर-व्यवस्था में सुधार होगा । महोदया, विशेष तौर पर ग्रामीण आबादी को सुविधाएं उपलब्ध कराने के लिए अनेक योजनाएं आरंभ की जा रही हैं । स्वजलधारा कार्यक्रम से पूरे देश में गांवों में पीने का पानी मुहैया कराने की वृहत योजना बनाई गई है । इसी तरह प्रधानमंत्री ग्राम सड़क योजना एक महत्वाकांक्षी योजना है, जिसे तेजी से लागू किया जा रहा है । सड़क निर्माण योजना के मामले में जितना काम आज़ादी के बाद के 50 वर्षों में नहीं किया गया, उतना काम पिछले तीन-चार वर्षों में किया गया है । सड़कों के साथ भारतीय रेल भी लगातार आगे बढ़ रही है। इसी तरह नागर-विमानन के क्षेत्र में नयी नीति बनाई जा रही है । कुल मिलाकर सरकार परिवहन और यात्रा को सरल बनाने के लिए कटिबद्ध है । सरकार यह महसूस करती है कि देश की आर्थिक प्रगति के लिए सड़क, रेल, जल और वायु परिवहन को बहुत महत्व मिलना चाहिए ।

महोदया, मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि सरकार का ध्यान समाज के कमजोर वर्गों की ओर खास तौर से गया है । सबके लिए साक्षरता, स्वास्थ्य सुविधा, पेयजल की सुविधा, इन चीजों को प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है । किसी को इस बात में संदेह नहीं होना चाहिए कि राष्ट्र सही दिशा की ओर अग्रसर नहीं हो रहा है ।

महोदया, इन्हीं थोड़े शब्दों के साथ मैं राष्ट्रपति जी को उनके सम्बोधन के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूं और सदन से आग्रह करता हूं कि इस धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव को सर्वसम्मति से स्वीकार किया जाए । धन्यवाद ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, there is a message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Water (Prevention And Control of Pollution) Cess (Amendment) Bill, 2003

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

> "In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Cess (Amendment) Bill, 2003, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th February, 2003.
>
> 2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of Article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 11.00 o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 25th February, 2003.